TITLE

The Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Iowa and other States 1854-1904

BY

Gerhard Sigmund Ottersberg

APPROVED	DATE
	May 28, 1949
Norman Hill	"
	"
Don W. Dysinger.	"
J L Sellers	"

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SYNOD OF IOWA AND OTHER STATES

1854-1904

by

Gerhard Sigmund Ottersberg

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA
LINCOLN 8, NEBRASKA

RSITY LIBRARIES

Permission is hereby granted to reproduce by photostatic means the contents of this thesis. The use made of the reproduction is to be governed by the same rules covering this original manuscript copy.

February 8, 1954
Date

Gerhard Ottersberg
Signature

Ottersberg, Gerhard Sigmund
The Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Iowa and Other States, 1854-1904.
Ph.D. Dissertation, 1949.

Lincoln, Nebraska

May 1949

UNIVERSITY
OF NEBRASKA
LIBRARY

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SYNOD OF IOWA AND OTHER STATES

1854-1904

by

Gerhard Sigmund Ottersberg

A THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College in the University of Nebraska
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Department of History

Under the Supervision of Professor J. L. Sellers

Lincoln, Nebraska
May 1949

UNIVERSITY
OF NEBRASKA
LIBRARY

PREFACE

This thesis was projected to cover the fifty year period indicated in the title. The volume of materials, however, proved to be so great as to make research of approximately exhaustive character possible only for the first half of the period, which accordingly is treated in detail in the first twenty chapters of the completed thesis. The last chapter brings a summary of main lines of development from 1879 to 1904.

In footnote references a number of abbreviations are used which are indicated on the occasion of the first citation of the relevant source. The practice of italicizing foreign words has been applied even in cases when German words are used in manuscript titles of sources or of individual documents, except in the case of letters.

The writer is grateful to Professor J. L. Sellers for helpful advice and guidance and for unfailing patience and assistance in securing extensions of time when the nature of the task and the limitations of the writer made it necessary to ask for them. Pastor E. Poppen, president of the American Lutheran Church, granted access to its archives, and Pastor S. Sandrock and Miss Elizabeth Reu, archivists, unstintingly made their resources available. Administration and staff of Wartburg Seminary generously placed the facilities of this institution at the disposal of the writer, in particular

Pastor William Goetz and Miss Reu, librarians, freely granted favors and gave consideration far beyond the call of duty. Gratitude is also due to owners of materials and to colleagues and many others who granted access to sources and gave aid, advice, criticism and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I 1854-1864

CHAPTER PAGE

I. BACKGROUND: LOEHE AND THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA . . . .

Missions in America 1-3

The Gesellschaft 4

Michigan colonies 6-8

Relations with American synods 5, 8-12

The Saginaw seminary 13-15

II. PRELUDE: BREAK WITH MISSOURI . . . .

Grossmann and Missouri 16

Problems in Frankenhilf 17-21

Problems in Saginaw 21-23

Consideration of removal to Iowa 23-26

Breach 26-29

III. ESTABLISHMENT: THE IOWA SYNOD . . . .

Removal to Iowa 30-33

Seminary and mission at Dubuque 33-35

St. Sebald 36-38

Abandonment of colonization plans 38-41

St. Sebald and Dubuque 41-43

Organization of the Synod 44-49

IV. FOUNTAIN: THE SEMINARY

Support through 1854 50-51

Acquisition of a building 51-53

CHAPTER PAGE

Financial difficulties 1854 and 1855 . . . 54-57

Preparatory school, curriculum, staff . . . 58-61

Removal to St. Sebald 61-64

Debt and the Kleinlein loan 65-66

Curriculum, management, economy at St. Sebald 67-71

Pressure of debt and Russian help 71-78

Attendance and instruction after 1860 . . . 78-80

Support American and European 80-82

Summary 83-84

V. POLICY: PRINCIPLES OF CONGREGATIONAL ORGANIZATION . . . .

Missionary enterprise instead of colonization 85-86

Ideals of practice 86-87

Discipline and catechumenate 87-89

Origin of the constitution for congregations 89-90

Admission of congregations, pastoral acts . 91-93

Revision of congregational constitution . . 93-95

Modifications of strict practice 95-98

Congregational organization 98-100

Criticism of congregational constitution . . 101

Instruction for young pastors 102-104

Abandonment of the select group ideal . . .104-106

CHAPTER PAGE

VI. COOPERATION: FRIENDSHIP WITH BUFFALO . . .

Buffalo and Neuendettelsau 107-109

Contact between Iowa and Buffalo 109-110

Transfer of western Wisconsin to Iowa . . 111-114

S. Fritschel to Buffalo 114-117

Buffalo aid and establishment of harmony . 118-121

Mutual aid and transfers 121-124

Dispute over eastern missions 125-128

Chiliast disputes 124, 128-130

S. Fritschel recalled 130-131

Doctrinal controversy and conferences . . 131-134

The break 135

Doerfler's chiliasm 136-137

Doerfler's resignation and Toledo visitation 138-141

Toledo joins Iowa 142-143

Toledo controversy 144-150

Disturbances and withdrawals 151-154

Summary 154-155

VII. EXPANSION: GROWTH 1854-1864 . . . .

Neuendettelsau source of manpower 156-158

Growth of the clerical roster 159-164

Missions developed from Dubuque 164-169

Missions developed from St. Sebald . . . 169-172

Missions in southern and central Iowa . . 172-176

CHAPTER PAGE

Reiseprediger in Iowa 176-180
Other *Reiseprediger* missions 181-183
A mission in Kansas 184
Missions in Wisconsin 185-188
Missions in Michigan and Ohio 188-195
Missions in Missouri and Illinois 196-200

VIII. PRACTICE: SELECT GROUP IDEOLOGY 1854-1864 .

Numerical strength 201
Select group ideology 201-205
Liturgy 205-206
Discipline 206-207
Physical difficulties 208-209
Frequency and character of services . . . 210
Parish education 211-215
Pastoral income 215-219
Parish properties 219-223
Congregational organization 223-224
Visitation 224-229
Synodical membership of congregations . . 229-230

IX. EXTENSION: THE INDIAN MISSION . . . .

Projects 1853-1856 231-235
A mission in Canada 236-237
The Lake Superior region 238-240
A visit to the Crows 241-244
Plans and preparations for a mission in Montana 245-249

CHAPTER PAGE

Expedition to Deer Creek 1859 249-251

Problems and hesitation 251-256

From Deer Creek to the Powder River 1860 . 256-261

Finances and German support 261-264

Disaster at the Powder River station . . 264-267

The Deer Creek station 268-271

Shift from Crows to the Cheyenne 271-276

Colonization and its problems 277-282

Missionary journeys and personnel 1861-1863 283-289

Adoption of Indian children 290-292

Station routine and missionary travel 1863-1864 293-298

Hostilities and withdrawal 1864 298-302

A last attempt 1866 302-305

Appraisal 305-309

X. CONSTITUTION: ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT 1854-1864 . . . .

An unwritten versus a written constitution 310-311

Ministerial conferences 312-318

Ministerialausschuss 318-321

Pastoral conferences 321-325

Synodical conventions 325-328

Regime of the Ausschuss 328-332

The constitution of 1864 333-336

Financial administration 336-340

Synodical property and incorporation . . 341-343

CHAPTER PAGE

XI. ACTIVITIES: SYNODICAL UNDERTAKINGS 1854-1864

The *Kirchen-Blatt* 342-351

The seminary printery 348-349

Hymnals 352-355

Other publications and *Chronik* 355-357

Care for aged or ill pastors 357-360

The Gademann Society 361-362

Toledo Orphanage 362-366

Andrew Orphanage 366-368

PART II 1864-1879

XII. WELL-SPRINGS: EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

1864-1879 . . . .

A preparatory school in the seminary . . . 370-373

Teacher training 373-375

Problems at St. Sebald 375-377

Removal of the college to Galena 377-384

College, seminary and debts 384-389

Reunion rejected 1871 390-395

Problems and difficulties 395-402

Removal of the seminary to Mendota . . . 402-407

College-seminary tension 407-412

Removal of the college to Mendota 1875 . . 413-417

Winding up affairs at Galena 417-423

College and seminary at Mendota 423-425

Moves toward a normal school . 383, 388, 425-426

CHAPTER PAGE

Establishment of a seminary for teachers . 427-430
A system of educational institutions . . 430-431

XIII. GROWTH: REACHING OUT TOWARD THE UNCHURCHED 1864-1879 . . . .

The synodical schools and manpower 432-433
Neuendettelsau 433-437
Melsungen and Hesse 437-444
The *Gotteskasten* and Mecklenburg 445-447
Other German sources 447-448
Gains and losses in personnel 449-450
Missionary methods, *Reiseprediger* 450-455
Growth in Iowa 456-458
Wisconsin 458-460
Illinois 460-463
Missouri 463-465
The Eastern District 465-469
Missions in the South 460-471
Minnesota 472-474
Nebraska, Kansas, Dakota 474-477
Summary 478-479

XIV. RESPONSIBILITY: SYNODICAL PRACTICE 1864-1879

Statistics on membership 480-481
New constitution for congregations . . . 482-486
Changing emphases 481-482, 487-488
Secret Societies, Grangers 489-492
Dancing, drinking, the press 492-494

CHAPTER PAGE

Pastoral acts and visitations, societies 495-497
Christenlehren 498-499
Parochial schools 500-505
English and German 506-508
Calls and congregational management 508-513
Membership in the synod 513-514
Synodical offerings and finance 515-520

XV. FUNCTIONS: SYNODICAL UNDERTAKINGS 1864-1879

Problem of the printery 521-523
Kirchenblatt 523-528
A theological magazine 529-530
Other publications and school texts 531-534
Hymnal 534-536
Hoerlein and a depository 536-539
Aid for pastors and *Pfarrwitwenkasse* 539-546
Relief and other projects 547
The Mutual Aid 547-549
Toledo Orphanage 549-555
Andrew Orphanage 555-562
Summary 562-563

XVI. REORGANIZATION: CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT
1864-1879

The constitution of 1864 564
Conferences, local and general 565-567
The president and his burdens 567-571
District projects 1868-1871 572-577

CHAPTER PAGE

The constitution of 1873 577-583
Synodical and district conventions . . 584-589
Revision of the constitution to 1879 . 590-592
Financial administration 593-596
Comment 596-597
XVII. CONTROVERSY: DOCTRINAL DISSENSION 1854-1875
The Founders, Neuendettelsau, Missouri . 598-601
Position on church and ministry 602-603
Position on the symbols 604-607
Position on chiliasm 607-610
Early identity with Neuendettelsau _Richtung_ 610-611
The controversial position of 1858 . . 611-616
Emergence of an Iowa _Richtung_ 616-621
Controversy and the _Gutachten_ 621-625
The convention of 1867 626-629
The colloquy of 1867 630-634
Failure of the colloquy 635-639
Usury and predestination 640-642
Hoerlein and Missouri 642-643
The convention at Davenport 644-647
The Schmidt articles 647-648
The situation in 1875 649-650
XVIII. FELLOWSHIP: RELATIONS WITH OTHER LUTHERANS 1854-1879 . . . .
Church fellowship - Missouri and Buffalo 651-652

CHAPTER PAGE

Wisconsin 653-655

Illinois and Minnesota 656-658

Michigan and Ohio 658-660

Scandinavian synods and Texas 660-661

The General Synod 662-663

Organization of General Council 663-665

Membership voted but deferred 665-669

Negotiation and opposition 669-672

The Akron Rule 673-676

The Galesburg Rule 676-679

Critique 679-681

XIX. CRISIS: THE UPHEAVAL OF 1875 . . . .

Development of a Missouri faction 682-686

Contact with Walther 686-689

Attack upon the Richtung 689-691

Klindworth versus synodical leadership . 692-698

Bauer's estrangement 698-702

The Denkschrift 702-705

Convention of 1875, Richtung debate . . 705-712

Madison theses and protests 711-716

Faction curbed and Richtung **vindicated** . 716-720

Klindworth and Neuendettelsau 720-722

Schism and withdrawals 723-729

Klindworth's friends 729-731

Klindworth's pamphlets 731-737

Klindworth's expulsion 738-740

CHAPTER PAGE

Iowa and Missouri 1875-1879 740-744

Adjustment with Neuendettelsau 744-750

Evaluation 750-752

XX. SIGNIFICANCE: THE IOWA SYNOD AND AMERICAN LUTHERANISM . . . .

Loehe's conceptions 753-754

Attempted realization through Missouri . 754-757

Iowa and Loehe's ideals 757-761

Opposition to General Synod American Lutheranism 761-762

Significance of the conflict with Missouri 763-765

Conflict and cooperation with the Council 765-766

Impact on American society 766-769

PART III 1879-1904

XXI. FUTURE: A SKETCH OF GROWTH TO 1904 . . .

Development of the normal school at Waverly 770-772

Removal of the college to Waverly . . . 772-775

Removal of the seminary to Dubuque . . . 775-777

Internal development of the seminary . . 778-781

Development of the college and its plant 782-786

The Clinton plan and its adoption . . . 786-792

CHAPTER PAGE

The Clinton debt 793-795

Development of the college at Clinton . . 795-798

Development of the school at Waverly . . 799-803

The synod and the college at Brenham, Texas 803-804

The system of educational institutions . 804-805

Growth in manpower 805-807

Organization of home mission work 807-812

Extension of missionary endeavor 812-816

The Jewish mission in Chicago 816-819

Admission of the Texas Synod 819-823

Plans for a mission in Brazil 824

Statistics of growth and practice . . . 824-826

Parochial schools 826-831

Congregational activities and finances . 831-835

Publications and Wartburg Publishing House 835-839

Care for aged pastors and their widows . 839-843

Life and Fire Insurance societies 840

Kirchbauanleihkasse 843-844

The orphanages and Muscatine 844-847

Multiplication of districts 848-850

Delegate synods and constitutional amendment 850-855

Conventions, conferences, and the presidency 855-859

CHAPTER PAGE

The predestination controversy 860-862

Colloquy with Ohio 862-864

Relations with the General Council . . . 865-867

Summary 868

BIBLIOGRAPHY 869

PART I

1854-1864

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND: LOEHE AND THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

Pastor Wilhelm Loehe of Neuendettelsau, a small village in Bavaria in the vicinity of Nuernberg, was the father of the Iowa Synod. Loehe was a pastor of great gifts and deep spiritual sincerity. In preaching and pastoral activities he stressed the Christian life, emphasizing such elements as private confession and public as well as brotherly discipline. His influence over his parishioners was deep and lasting.[1]

Conscientiously devoted to his charge and to the development of intimate personal relations with its individual members, his many-sided endowment and abundant energies were not wholly absorbed by the small and rather poor country parish. He engaged in a variety of studies and wrote a number of theological treatises. A field of especial interest, in which he engaged in extensive and thorough research, was liturgics. The result was an emphasis on the introduction of correct liturgical usages and the publication of his *Agende*, which is still in use.[2] On the practical side he became interested in charitable projects of increasing

---

[1] H. R. Greenholt, *A Study of Wilhelm Loehe, His Colonies and the Lutheran Indian Missions in the Saginaw Valley of Michigan*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 5, 6.

[2] *Ibid*., 7-9. An *Agende* is a book of liturgical forms and practices.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

variety and number, which led to the establishment at Neuendettelsau of an ever increasing number of institutions finally numbering eighteen, including hospitals, asyla, rescue homes and a mother house for deaconesses.[3]

These institutional activities lay in the field of inner missions as distinguished from foreign missions and represented a later interest, the antecedent of which was a missionary interest in unchurched Lutherans in the United States. With the rapid settlement of the trans-Allegheny region many German immigrants made their way into the Old Northwest. Lutheran missionary endeavor in trying to follow them with spiritual ministrations was handicapped by a lack of pastors. In 1841 Loehe saw an appeal written by Pastor F. Wyneken, of Fort Wayne, Indiana, who was engaged in this work and who asked for German support. The appeal moved Loehe to publish one of his own which resulted in monetary contributions. It also induced two young men to ask Loehe to give them training so that they might engage in missionary work in America. Although he had not intended to organize an undertaking of his own, together with a neighbor, Pastor J. F. Wucherer, he undertook the task. The two men, Ernst and Burger, were instructed to make their living by their trades, but to organize parochial schools and serve them, working for their own support in the evening. If the need for pastoral service should arise, they were to apply to an American Lutheran church for ordination and to comply with whatever demands it might make for further training.[4]

---

[3] Ibid., 10, 11.

The two emissaries became connected with the Ohio Synod, the theological seminary of which had been located at Columbus, Ohio, since 1831.[5] Both were soon ordained and the Synod asked for more men of similar training.[6] Wyneken came to Germany in person in 1842, renewing his appeal.[7] After Loehe had vainly attempted to transfer the work to a general conference of German state churches, he undertook its organization himself.[8] At first thinking primarily of teachers, he had by 1845 come to the conviction that the emissaries must also be trained as pastors.[9] He called them Nothhelfer, emergency workers, and met criticisms of inadequate training with the argument of necessity,[10] stressing teaching, administration of the sacraments and liturgy over preaching. Indeed they might use the sermons of others, if they were candid about the authorship.[11]

---

[4] J. Deinzer, Wilhelm Loehe's Leben, Guetersloh, 1892, III, 7, 8.

[5] P. H. Buehring, The Beginnings of Lutheranism in Ohio, unpublished master's dissertation, University of Chicago, 58.

[6] Deinzer, op. cit., 14, 20.

[7] Ibid., 12.

[8] Ibid., 16.

[9] Greenholt, op. cit., 46, 47.

[10] Ibid., 48.

In the course of time a rather elaborate organization was set up in support of both American and German undertakings, the Gesellschaft fuer Innere Mission im Sinne der Lutherischen Kirche.[12] It had four divisions of which Abtheilung I was in charge of the home mission enterprises in North America. A Missionsanstalt or seminary, founded in 1846, took charge of the training of the emissaries, located at first in Nuernberg under the direction of F. Bauer, who subsequently was titled Inspektor and after 1853 at Neuendettelsau. Its purposes were at first preparatory, by 1856 they were: to train young Lutheran volunteers of fine Christian spirit and outstanding ability, who had had good preliminary training, as pastors or teachers or preferably as both. The training was to require not less than two nor more than three years and to prepare the emissaries to enter the ministry or to serve as teachers immediately on arrival in America. They were to serve emigrated Lutherans who lacked instruction or eccelesiastic care or were driven to seek them from strange confessions or sects, also the pagans of North America who could readily be reached from the territory of the home missions there.[13] In 1843 publication of a paper, devoted to the cause was begun, the Kirchliche Mittheilungen aus und ueber Nord-Amerika.[14]

---

[11] Ibid., 51.

[12] Society for Inner Missions according to the tradition of the Lutheran Church. It will be referred to hereafter as the Gesellschaft.

The connection between Loehe and the Ohio Synod did not last long. In a controversy over the establishment of an English chair in the seminary at Columbus, underlying which there were differences in confessional principle, the Nothhelfer sided with a German party and withdrew when it was defeated in 1845.[15] They joined with Saxon Lutherans in Missouri and Wyneken in founding the Missouri Synod in 1847 and for some years thereafter Loehe's emissaries entered this body. Loehe also raised the means for founding a practical seminary which trained both pastors and teachers at that time at Fort Wayne, Indiana, which was given to the Missouri Synod. The school in Nuernberg under Bauer at this time gave preliminary training and then sent its men to Fort Wayne, where their training was completed. Thus for a number of years he supplied this body with a considerable number of men from Germany and also enabled it to train men in America. A total of eighty-four pastors supplied by or through Loehe were a factor in the rapid growth of the Missouri Synod.[16]

---

[13] Kirchliche Mittheilungen aus und ueber Nord-Amerika, 1856, 1 & 2, 2, 3. This paper will hereafter be referred to as K. M.

[14] Ecclesiastical news from and about North America.

[15] Greenholt, op. cit., 55.

In the meantime Loehe had also become interested in missions among the American Indians. Contacts were made with the Michigan Synod, which was attempting to set up missions among the Indians in that state. A plan was devised to send out a colony to settle in Indian territory and to add the example of Christian living to the efforts of missionaries. A little group was organized in Bavaria which called Pastor A. Kraemer and left in a body in the spring of 1845. A settlement, called Frankenmut was established near Saginaw. Pioneering difficulties, especially malaria, followed upon a tedious voyage in a sailing vessel, but a successful beginning soon attracted additional settlers and a splendid congregation distinguished by sincerity and churchliness soon came into existence. Confessional differences soon led to a withdrawal from the Michigan Synod and in 1847 this group also was among the founders of the Missouri Synod. Pastor Kraemer besides serving Frankenmut also undertook the foundation of an Indian mission. He learned the Chippewa language, visited their camps and tried with little success to get them to settle on mission land. Some Indian children attended his school, learned German as well as English and a number were baptized. Luther's Catechism was translated into

---

[16] J. L. Neve, Kurzgefasste Geschichte der Lutherischen Kirche Amerikas, German Literary Board, 1915, 2nd edition, 224.

Chippewa. The mission met some opposition from traders and missionaries of American denominations, but the chief obstacle was the progressive removal of the Indians. After some years the mission was removed from Frankenmut to a station farther north, but after flourishing through the decade of the fifties, it too dwindled as the Indians again moved away.[17]

Although colonization had at first been incidental to the project for an Indian mission, it received further development over the ensuing years. While Loehe did not undertake to encourage emigration, he felt that it might be well, if those who had decided to migrate could be brought together in colonies, supplied with pastors and so enabled to establish German and Lutheran settlements which might attract others of like mind.[18] In 1847 a second colony, Frankentrost, was established not far from Frankenmut, in consequence of advice given a part of the emigrants who were planning to go to Frankenmut, to establish a new colony instead as a second nucleus to attract others.[19] In 1848 Loehe established a revolving colonization fund and founded a third colony nearby, Frankenlust.[20] Both colonies received pastors who joined the Missouri Synod.

---

[17] E. A. Mayer, Geschichte der evangelisch-lutherischen St. Lorenz-Gemeinde U. A. C. zu Frankenmuth, Michigan. Published on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary, this history is a convenient summary of this enterprise.

[18] K. M. 1848, 11 & 12, 84.

[19] Ibid., 83, 84.

[20] Ibid., 84, 85.

In 1850 the fourth colony Frankenhilf was established in order to enable poor young people who could not marry in Germany, because of financial licensing requirements, and who frequently lived together without a marriage ceremony, to establish homes in the new world with an opportunity eventually to acquire their own property.[21] The congregation, largely dependent on home support was to remain under German supervision, although the pastor, J. Deindoerfer, who arrived in 1851 because the original settlers dispersed and the original pastor had gone elsewhere, joined the Missouri Synod.

A rift, however, was developing between that body and Loehe. As early as at the time of the organization of the Missouri Synod Loehe felt that the doctrine of the ministry held by the Saxon pastors and reflected in the constitution was too democratic, but he did not press his objections, in order not to impede the formation of the synod.[22] In the meantime controversy involving the doctrine of the church and that of the ministry had arisen between the Missouri and the Buffalo Synods. The latter had been established by Pastor J. A. A. Grabau, who had led a group of Prussian Lutherans to the vicinity of Buffalo, New York, because of conflicts within the Prussian union between the Lutheran and Reformed Confessions. Grabau had established a strongly hierarchical system, in which the pastor was not only accorded control in spiritual matters, but also in temporal affairs, at least in all things not opposed to the Scriptures, and the congregation was bound to obedience. He was led to this position by a fear that in free America congregations would misuse their power under a democratic organization and by the belief that the ordination was a divine institution. In regard to the church he held that it was a visible organization of believers who have the pure Word and sacraments and that therefore the Lutheran Church which alone met these conditions was the church of God on earth.

---

[21] *Ibid.*, 1850, 5, 35.

[22] Deinzer, *op. cit.*, 20, 31.

The hierarchical system led to quarrels and opposition in Buffalo congregations, which were met by excommunication of members and congregations. In some instances the Missouri Synod received such groups, with the result that bitterly waged controversies arose between the two synods.[23] Pastor C. F. W. Walther, the great theological leader of Missouri, believed that Grabau was in error in regard to both the doctrines on the church and on the ministry and his synod adopted his views and staunchly stood for them. The church he held to be essentially invisible, composed of true believers of all faiths. The ministry was a divine institution, derivative, however, from the universal priesthood of believers. The office really belonged through the universal priesthood to all members of a congregation and was transferred by them through the call to the individual pastor, who then was entitled to reverence and obedience when ministering the Word, but not to arbitrary authority in indifferent matters.[24] Ordination was a human, not a divine institution. Views conflicting so sharply readily explain the conflicts in practice to which reference has been made. The controversy soon began to attract wider attention.

---

[23] Ibid., 84, 85.

Loehe did not agree entirely with either Grabau or Walther. As to the church, it had both an invisible and a visible aspect. On the ministry he thought Grabau extreme in his assertions as to the extent of pastoral authority, but believed both the ministry and the ordination to be divine institutions and he did not accept Walther's transference theory.[25] He gave considerable thought to the controversy on the ministry and published the result of his studies in his Aphorismen, 1849 and Neue Aphorismen, 1851. Like Grabau he feared consequences of the democracy implicit in the transference theory. If in Germany tradition and stability sometimes interfered with the development of desirable innovations, in America the opposite extreme was likely to prevail,

---

[24] Wm. Dahlmann, W. H. J. Dau, Th. Engelder, Walther and the Church, 71-85. Theses defining Walther's position.

[25] Deinzer, op. cit., 86, 87.

Td c.1

despite constitutions and agreements pastors lacked security and schisms in congregations were common occurrences; Missouri's doctrine of the ministry furnished a basis for this.[26] It was a reaction, he thought from the extreme hierarchism of Stephan's time. He also felt that Walther had derived his position from the symbols and from Luther and that the general validity of this support was debatable, while he based his own position upon Scriptures.[27]

As Loehe's writings disputed Walther's position, there was also foreshadowed a more fundamental controversy, which later was to grow into major proportions, on the authority and binding character of the symbols or confessions of the Lutheran Church, or of the position toward them, taken by parties in controversy over doctrinal questions referred to in the symbols in any way. The differences caused concern on both sides of the water and in 1850 the Missouri Synod fearing romanizing trends[28] in Loehe's position invited him to visit America for a discussion.[29] When he was unable to come, the Synod sent Walther and Wyneken to visit him. They arrived in September 1851[30] and, visiting him thrice, held long and thorough discussions in which Bauer also participated. No real agreement resulted. Loehe published an account in which he emphasized the unity in spirit, but made it clear that there was no full agreement in detail. The differences did not need immediate settlement, indeed it was not desirable to reach a final settlement before the questions had been discussed more fully and generally.[31] Walther also published a statement in which he spoke of Loehe in glowing terms and asserted that the bond of unity had been tightened,[32] and in another statement indicated that a second meeting had drawn them together even closer than Loehe's statement made it appear. However, in this second statement he also indicated disagreement with Loehe's assertion that neither side considered the matter ripe for definitive settlement, stating that Missouri had reached the conviction that the symbols settled the question.[33]

---

[26] K. M. 1850, 8, 60, 61. He goes on to say: "Indem sie das Amt von dem geistlichen Priestertum aller Christem herleiten und wie eine von den Gemeinden ueberlieferte Vollmacht ansehen und also lehren, legen sie selbst in die Haende ihrer Gemeinde jene demokratische Uebermacht, welche niemals taugt. Wenn die Schafe den Hirten sezen (sic), entfernen, verlassen, verwerfen koennen, werden sie nur geweidet werden koennen, wie ihnen selbst die Ohren juecken, ...," 61.

[27] Deinzer, op. cit., 80-85.

[28] The charge of romanizing tendencies was to be repeated and emphasized in later years. Certain actions and writings by Loehe in later years raised a storm of criticism and gave offense even to friends. Greenholt, op. cit., 14, 15, asserts that they even led to an invitation-rejected-from Roman Catholic sources to join that church.

---

[29] K. M. 1851 10, 76.

[30] Ibid., 77. On their arrival they met Pastor Deindoerfer just before his embarkation for Frankenhilf.

[31] Ibid., 77, 78.

[32] Lutheraner VIII, 13, 97, 98.

[33] Ibid., VIII, 15, 113, 114.

In these declarations yet another later controversy is foreshadowed, that of open questions, Loehe holding that there was an area of doctrinal controversy, where agreement was not necessary among Lutherans and Missouri on the whole rejecting this position as dangerous.

Loehe had for some time been considering the establishment of a Pilgerhaus, a kind of hostel, in America and in connection with it had considered the establishment of a separate seminary for teachers.[34] Walther and Wyneken during their visit stressed the need for the establishment of a teachers' seminary and fairly definite plans for its establishment through Loehe in Detroit were made. These plans underwent certain changes, the institution was opened at Saginaw, because of excessive costs at Detroit, and G. Grossmann succeeded Cand. Hacker, who had been selected to head the undertaking but withdrew. Loehe's plans were rather extensive. A manager, J. Weege, was also appointed and he and Grossmann were to consider ways and means, including the establishment of a corporation, for the purpose of buying up the best lands in Saginaw and Tuscola Counties, so as to withdraw them from American speculators and reserve them for colonization by German Lutheran immigrants. Together with Pastor Cloeter in Saginaw they were to establish the Pilgerhaus to accommodate newly arrived immigrants temporarily and to house the teachers' seminary as well as a school which was to serve as a practice school for the seminary and, if agreeable, as parochial school for Pastor Cloeter. If possible the Pilgerhaus was to be so located that gardening or farming might be carried on in its support. The students, limited for the time being to five or six, were to live under a liturgical division of the day, they were to carry on the devotional exercises and beyond that were to give their time to study and to agricultural work and were to serve the lodgers.[35]

---

[34] Instruction des Besuchers in Michigan, Herrn Wilhelm Sommer, Nuernberg, Neuendettelsau, April 1, 1850, Leipzig, April 11, 1850. This document in Loehe Papers is a typewritten copy. Sommer was to look for lands suitable for colonization in Michigan and perhaps Upper Canada. He was also to look for and acquire a site for a Pilgerhaus, conveniently located for immigrants. Building plans were to be submitted in detail, though general directions as to its plan and facilities were given. It was to house a teachers' seminary and it was to be made clear that for the present it was not to be placed under the direction of the Missouri Synod.

During 1852 the Pilgerhaus was erected at Saginaw and even before construction had begun Grossmann arrived with five students.[36] The institution was to serve the Missouri Synod, the graduates were to be placed at its disposal, however, it was not given to the Synod, but remained at least for the time being under German control and Grossmann and Weege had signed an agreement not to accept another call without German consent,[37] but were free to join the synod if they wished.[38] If reservation of control expressed caution over against Missouri on Loehe's part, it did not mean a withdrawal from cooperation as the designation of the graduates indicates. Pastor Cloeter, a member of the synod, was intimately connected with the Pilgerhaus and was also called upon to assist in teaching in the seminary. The Pilgerhaus did not prove attractive to immigrants[39] and Loehe soon began to look upon it merely as the home of the seminary. But the seminary too was not destined to remain at Saginaw very long.

---

[35] These data are taken from a document entitled: Vereinbarung der Unterzeichneten Privatpersonen zur Foerderung des Deutsch Lutherischen Colonisations-und Missionswerkes in der Grafschaft Saginaw. It is in the Iowa Synod Documents, hereafter cited as I. S. D. At the end it bears the date, Neuendettelsau, den 8.--ten Maerz 1859, and the signatures of Grossmann, Weege, Loehe, Bauer, and three others, at least two of whom were associated with the Gesellschaft. It also provided for regular quarterly reports as well as special reports and detailed accountings and specified compensation for Weege and Grossmann. The latter was to receive lodging, firewood as long as it could be obtained from the seminary lands, for one room, and board and laundry, provided that he took charge of these arrangements. Students who had means of their own were expected to pay for their accommodations, apparently over and above the work they were expected to do. Those who lacked means, were to be given support from German sources.

---

[36] K. M. 1863, 2, 11. They arrived at the end of June, were at first quartered with members of the congregation and then rented a store building, where they lived and where instruction began on July 1. They also assisted in construction of the Pilgerhaus and were able to move in late in the fall.

[37] Vereinbarung.

[38] K. M. 1853, 12, 92.

[39] Ibid., 91.

CHAPTER II

PRELUDE: BREAK WITH MISSOURI

Immediately after the visit of Walther and Wyneken at Neuendettelsau both parties seem to have felt that collaboration between Loehe and the Missouri Synod might go on unimpeded. Loehe clearly thought of not only continuing his past activities, but of further ventures in colonization. In fact, however, the establishment of the seminary at Saginaw was to accentuate the doctrinal controversy. Perhaps the withdrawal of Hacker, of whom the Missouri visitors had approved,[1] and the substitution of Grossmann[2] was the turning point. For Grossmann agreed with Loehe's views and refused to join the Missouri Synod, or even to comply with a pressing invitation to attend its sessions.[3] There was also some resentment about the shift of location from Detroit, where Pastor Schaller of the Missouri Synod was to be associated with it, and some indication that Fort Wayne was considered preferable to Saginaw, if costs in Detroit were prohibitive.[4] Missouri leaders appear to have suspected that the seminary was to serve as center in Missouri territory, but among people predisposed in favor of Loehe, to disseminate theological views in conflict with those which the Synod had definitively adopted.[5]

---

[1] Lutheraner XI, 12, 94. Wyneken makes the statement.

[2] G. J. Fritschel, Aus den Tagen der Vaeter, Chicago, 1930, 4-8, explains that Hacker withdrew for personal reasons, disappointing, if not disgusting Loehe. Grossmann, who then was with Loehe, preparatory to going to America was substituted at the last moment.

[3] Grossmann feared the strong esprit de corps of a synodical meeting would sweep him into joining in a burst of enthusiasm. Deindoerfer had come to join in that way and regretted it. K. M. 1853, 12, 93.

Difficulties were also brewing in Frankenhilf. Loehe's plan had been to gather a nucleus of single, blameless, young men and women and some experienced adults and to associate with them some of the unmarried couples with their illegitimate children, who might be redeemable.[6] They were to be responsible for their own passage, but to be assisted with funds to buy land, build cabins and make a start. He also considered the establishment of local industries, to furnish employment in the off season.[7] But the group of 280 people, married and single, which came out under Pastor Kuehn in 1850 dispersed among the other colonies, only one man with his family, G. Amman, apparently a man of some means, went to Frankenhilf and amid the usual difficulties established himself there.[8] Apparently impecunious immigrants, single or not, found it easier to make a start in settlements which were already established or in cities like Saginaw, where there was demand for labor.[9]

---

[4] Lutheraner XI, 12, 93. Sihler makes the statement about expenses. P. 95 Wyneken makes it appear that Missouri originally proposed location at Fort Wayne, Loehe objected and then Detroit was settled upon.

[5] Wyneken gave this interpretation, Ibid., 94, 95.

[6] Greenholt, op. cit., 146.

[7] Ibid., 147.

[8] Ibid., 150-152.

Thereafter the colony grew but slowly, although by 1851 several additional families had moved in, so that Deindoerfer was sent out as pastor. He lived with Amman, whose home had also been dedicated for the purpose of holding services there by Pastor Kuehn, before he left.[10] In 1852 a church building was begun, but not completed until 1853. This venture meant considerable financial strain for so small a group and the rather elaborate property and endowment provisions of the congregational constitution, adopted before the first settlers left Germany,[11] could mature but slowly. Loehe proposed to withdraw the colonization capital, no longer needed in the older settlements and to place it in the Frankenhilf church fund, so that additional immigration might be furthered. Frankenhilf thus would become an institutional church, subject to supervision by the German patrons.[12] For a time at least this arrangement was actually in force. Loehe also asked Deindoerfer to sign an agreement, similar to Grossmann's and Weege's not to leave his position without consent of the German patrons, adding that he would like to apply it to the pastors of all the colonies, but thought they would not agree, nor could he expect them to assume an obligation which did not exist when they accepted their calls.[13] Deindoerfer agreed,

---

[9] A letter, F. Sievers - W. Loehe, February 16, 1851, of which a typewritten copy is in the I. S. D., states that land was sold to these settlers at Frankenhilf by Pastor Kuehn before they had seen it. Sievers who at the time was managing the colonization fund criticized this practice as mistaken and in any case unenforceable. Settlers should be advised to see the lands prepared for them, but left free to choose. He added that Frankenhilf would prosper after it got roads. K. M. 1852, 8, 61 states that the original colonists recoiled from the difficulties of starting a new colony.

[10] Greenholt, op. cit., 151-3. Amman maintained Deindoerfer in his home at his own expense.

[11] The constitution is printed K. M. 1850, 8, 62-64; 9, 67-71. It provided for contributions according to the property of the settlers toward the establishment of an endowment fund, to be invested in land to be used for support of the pastor, maintenance of the property and during vacancies for a fund for support of pastors' widows and orphans; excess income was to go to support of the poor of the congregation. Voluntary gifts and offerings were also expected as

---

well as perquisites for ministerial acts to be regulated definitely according to principles laid down in the constitution.

In a letter J. Deindoerfer - Wilhelm Loehe, December 6, 1852, a typecopy of which is in I. S. D. and in which Deindoerfer makes a report on Frankenhilf affairs, states that the fixed contributions to the fund were changed as undesirable, making money a practical condition of membership, and hard to enforce. A voluntary contribution was to be substituted. He asked Loehe's advice, since formulation was not yet definite. An earlier letter W. Loehe - J. Deindoerfer, August 12, 1852, of which there is also a typecopy in I. S. D. had stated that the congregation was free to change the constitution, but that changes should be reported, because the German patrons must be able to assure themselves that it contained nothing of which they could not approve.

[12] Greenholt, op. cit., 155.

[13] Letter, Loehe - Deindoerfer, August 8, 1852, typecopy in I. S. D. Loehe wrote that Walther and Wyneken had agreed that in the colonies pastors should not be shifted without consent from Germany.

informing Loehe that he was right in assuming that the other pastors would not do so.[14] Deindoerfer had become a member of the Missouri Synod, although apparently he had been given advisory membership only, because the congregation did not join,[15] but he continued to adhere to Loehe's doctrinal position and became closely associated with Grossmann in Saginaw.

Missouri pastors in the meantime had cooled toward the entire colonization scheme. Some of the pastors in the Saginaw region wrote to Loehe, pointing out that solid German Lutheran settlements were not an unmixed blessing, preventing assimilation and furthering the maintenance of a merely traditional church membership and even the perpetuation of undesirable German characteristics and vices.[16] As a group, with the exception of only Deindoerfer and Grossmann, these pastors had accepted the Missouri position on the ministry and were attempting to convert the two dissidents to their way of thinking. Although the relations were at first friendly,[17] they gradually became strained. The Frankenhilf peculiarities drew criticism. The charge of hierarchism began to be leveled and members of the older colonies began to carry it into the congregation. Soon there was a party which demanded the abrogation of the patronate and which desired that the congregation join the Missouri Synod. Deindoerfer opposed such a course, supported by Amman, but his position became more and more uncomfortable.

---

[14] Deindoerfer - Loehe, December 6, 1852, also in I. S. D. Deindoerfer added that at a conference in Saginaw Prof. A. Kraemer had denounced the requirement, because members of the synod must remain at its disposition. Deindoerfer and Grossmann had upheld Loehe on the point. Wyneken later expressed disapproval of the requirement. Lutheraner XI, 12, 94.

[15] Lutheraner XI, 12, 91.

[16] Letter F. Sievers - W. Loehe, Frankenlust P. O., December 6, 1854, typecopy in I. S. D. Colony congregations often desired the very things in America, which normal congregations had rejected as unsound. They were apt to be exceedingly parsimonious and ungenerous in the support of their pastors. They also remained unprogressive in farming methods, slow to adopt machinery, etc. He was not writing of any particular congregation, but he himself would never again colonize.

As the conflict sharpened Grossmann's position too became difficult. Pastor Cloeter in Saginaw, to whose congregation he belonged, was particularly insistent in demanding that Grossmann accomodate himself to the Missouri position, and that Loehe turn the seminary over to the synod or remove it from Saginaw. Grossmann and Deindoerfer drew closer together, with the support of Manager Weege, whose daughter Deindoerfer married, and stood their ground firmly.

---

[17] Grossmann remarks that he was cordially received by Cloeter on his arrival, in an historical article written ten years later. Kirchen-Blatt der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Synode von Iowa, which will be referred to as K. B. VI, 1, 1. Relations at the beginning of the school were friendly, pastors cordial and helpful. Ibid., 2. A letter, Sievers - Loehe, Frankenlust, July 4, 1853, typecopy in I. S. D., urging removal, still speaks of Grossmann personally in cordial and appreciative terms.

Loehe, who remained firm in his own position,[18] informed them that the seminary could not in the present controversial situation be turned over to Missouri and opposed the idea of leaving Saginaw, at the same time promising support to Deindoerfer at Frankenhilf and discussing new colonization ventures and even the possibility of establishing a female seminary at Saginaw.[19]

A crisis arose when Cloeter placed Grossmann under permanent discipline and Grossmann in turn withdrew from the congregation. Wyneken, then president of Missouri, was called in and both actions were withdrawn.[20] Wyneken, however, considered it intolerable that the situation continue as it was and suggested that if the Loehe adherents could not come to an agreement they ought to go somewhere, where Missouri was not established, casually mentioning California or Iowa.[21] Missouri considered the Saginaw region as its own and one in which it could not permit a challenge of its official position.[22] And how could it support and cherish an institution for training teachers who were to go out into its congregations, but headed by a man confessing doctrines which synod had opposed for years.[23]

---

[18] K. M. 1853, 7, 49-56 and 8, 57-60 contains an open letter, probably to Grossmann, in which Loehe stated, that after the report on the meeting with Walther and Wyneken, printed K. M. 1851, 10, they returned and told him that their view was final, but that his acknowledgment that he could see how they might arrive at their view, without being able to concede that it was fully and firmly founded in Scriptures, satisfied them fully (49, 50). He had since read Walther's book on the subject, but had not changed his view that the Lutheran Church had always been divided on the point, that it had never required agreement on it as a symbolically fixed doctrine and that Scriptures still seemed to him to justify his view rather than Walther's.

[19] Letter, Loehe - Grossmann, Deindoerfer, Weege and Amman, undated but probably written early in 1853, in I. S. D. Loehe asserted that the Missouri visitors were told that the seminary would not be turned over to the synod for the present. It sufficed if the staff were in church fellowship with the synod, membership was not necessary. Opposition though firm should peaceful. If Cloeter would not cooperate that would have to be borne. If Missouri would not take the graduates, they should easily be able to find other places. For the present only one additional student would be sent, --Kraenzlein.

[20] K. B. VI, 1, 4.

Thus Loehe's adherents were placed under strong pressure. Up to this time, 1853, apparently neither they nor Loehe had thought seriously of removal. Loehe indeed had strongly objected to the suggestion.[24] In 1852 he had reasserted his belief in colonization in opposition to the critical views of Missouri pastors. History taught that those who let conditions master them, disappear; Germans had always had a tendency to disappear in a population mixture. Could not they rise above this tendency? The colonization fund was available both for the original purposes of Frankenhilf and for new undertakings.[25] Deindoerfer had agreed, that prospects were excellent in the region, and that Lutheranism could prosper, but only if it maintained its German nationality. He made suggestions for the better realization of the purposes of Frankenhilf and even suggested that selected individuals be given enough training in English, that they might be able to fill public office in the colonies.[26]

---

[21] Missouri later disputed this assertion and it seems clear that Wyneken, did not mean to direct the Loehe men to Iowa, where Missouri had already contemplated missions. Loehe had for some time been considering a new mission in California, K. M. 1853, 2, 12. The whole of 4 and 5 and part of 6 is devoted to a description of California.

[22] K. B. VI, 1, 4.

[23] Lutheraner XI, 12, 94. This is Wyneken's own viewpoint, but written several years later.

[24] In the undated letter already cited, footnote 19, where he had gone so far as to state that if necessary the school could die.

---

[25] Letter, Loehe - Deindoerfer, August 12, 1852, typecopy in I. S. D.

[26] Letter, Deindoerfer - Loehe, December 6, 1852, typecopy in I. S. D. Deindoerfer advised careful selection of immigrants, weaklings could not endure the hardships involved. No great amounts were needed in support of the poor, unless illness complicated matters. For the first year $30.00-$40.00 should normally suffice, with half that amount for the second year, after that no further support would be required, but repayments could be begun. Support should be given not in money, but in supplies purchased at times when prices were most favorable. He admitted that settlers in colonies did not learn what they should learn from their American neighbors, and that undesirable traits existed, but held that spiritual stimulation through brotherly communion produced a contrast between colonies and ordinary congregations which led to the result that one felt at home in the one, and like a stranger in the other.

Even in March 1853, Loehe was still writing about a landed endowment for the seminary and suggesting that it undertake to publish a paper, which in the first issue was to state its doctrinal position and thereafter avoid controversy and concentrate on news from home, which he undertook to furnish.[27]

But to Grossmann and Deindoerfer the situation was becoming untenable toward the middle of 1853. The strained relationship with Cloeter, who had carried his controversy with Grossmann into the congregation,[28] and whose agitation had lined up the clergy so solidly, that the Saginaw Conference addressed a request to Loehe that he remove the school,[29] was telling on Grossmann. Deindoerfer was having trouble with the opposing faction in Frankenhilf, which objected to contributing agreed-upon labor on a church building, which they held would not belong to them, and which was being disturbed by zealots from Frankenmut, quoting supposed statements of Wyneken about being robbed of most glorious privileges and rights.[30] Under such conditions the Loehe adherents conferred and reached the decision that Deindoerfer and Amman should travel to Iowa, to look into the possibilities.

---

[27] Loehe - Grossmann, Weege, Deindoerfer and Amman, Neuendettelsau, March 31, 1853, Loehe Papers. Loehe in this letter tells his correspondents that if they should agree with Missouri in the doctrinal controversy, to be frank about their position, on his part it would not impair their friendship.

[28] _K_. _B_. VI, 1, 2, 3.

[29] Letter, Sievers - Loehe, Frankenmut, July 4, 1853, typecopy in I. S. D. He asserted that Grossmann said, he would leave, if Loehe gave the seminary to the synod. Holding that the controversy had disturbed harmony in Saginaw, he asked Loehe to remove the seminary. Pending a reply they would continue as they were, Cloeter would teach. Four students, who accepted the Missouri view could receive calls, one had already received his. If Loehe did not remove the school, they would have to hold it schismatic.

Traveling by water, rail and stagecoach they reached Dubuque after a week and then traveled on foot northwestward into Clayton County, abandoning earlier intentions to visit Iowa City. They were enthusiastic about the hilly region in Clayton County, not far from Strawberry Point, where a surveyor showed them an area which they considered suitable for a colony to be planted there. Good land, improving communications, unchurched Germans, a lively city at Dubuque, opportunity for Indian missions toward the north and west, all favored a new start there.[31] Iowa was a new state admitted in 1846 and a most logical choice for colonizing groups. Loehe's consent was asked and received[32] and soon preparations were under way for the journey. Grossmann reports that at the last moment Missouri offered to tolerate them, until they should recognize the truth, on condition that they engage in further discussion. When they declined, Missouri accused them of creating a schism and denied them altar fellowship, a measure which they themselves refused to apply to Missouri.[33]

---

[30] Letter, Deindoerfer - Loehe, Frankenhilf, 1853. Fragmentary typecopy in I. S. D.

[31] A long report on this journey appears in K. M. 1854, forming the entire content of 1, 2, 3 and occupying pp. 25 and 26 of 4.

[32] K. B. VI, 1, 3. Loehe wrote K. M. 1853, 13, 95 that Grossmann was unwilling to stay in Saginaw, if Loehe wished to continue there.

The removal to Iowa constituted the final breach between Loehe and the Missouri Synod. Loehe and his followers continued to recognize Missouri as Lutheran and desired to maintain church fellowship for a long time to come. The difference in the disputed doctrines was to them non-church-separating. Loehe admitted that the Missouri view had always been held in the Lutheran church and that it had strong historical and symbolical support, but was not convinced that it was scriptural. Until the Lutheran church as a whole should come to a final decision, both views might exist side by side. For himself he asked the right peacefully to present his point of view in theological discussion. He believed that in America particularly there was room for a school taking a position midway between the Missouri and Buffalo extremes. If his adherents could conscientiously adopt this position, he hoped that they would take and defend it.[34] He had clearly intended to keep control of the seminary at Saginaw and to maintain and strengthen his position in the colonies. It may well be, that his ultimate purpose was to maintain within the Missouri Synod a center of opposition to Walther's doctrinal domination and thus to prevent that body from assuming the rigid position toward which it tended.

---

[33] K. B. VI, 1, 3; also in K. M. 1863, 3, 19, 20.

[34] Loehe - Grossmann, Deindoerfer, Weege and Amman, March 31, 1854, typecopy of the letter is in I. S. D.

In the last analysis the breach was due to Walther's determination to enforce doctrinal uniformity[35] and to acceptance of this point of view by the synod. The men whom Loehe had directed to Missouri came to accept this attitude wholeheartedly,[36] with the exception only of Deindoerfer and Grossmann. The pastors of the Saginaw region in the main were emissaries of Loehe. They were in turn able to impart their attitude to the laity as a whole in the colonies. From Missouri's point of view, Loehe's measures to secure his position must have seemed irritating. Probably the synod did not really intend to force the removal of the seminary, but to apply pressure to secure conformity. When Loehe's adherents would not conform, the removal resulted in a breach which was manifested through the denial of altar fellowship and eventually of church fellowship altogether.

---

[35] Iowa writers believed that Walther had never intended to tolerate Loehe's views indefinitely, but that he was hopeful that Loehe would come to agree with him. When this did not occur, he regarded Loehe as heretical. G. J. Fritschel, Geschichte der Lutherischen Kirche in Amerika, Guetersloh, 1897, II, 220, 221. J. Deindoerfer, Geschichte der Evangel-Luth. Synode von Iowa, Chicago, 1897, 27.

[36] Some of them had never studied under Loehe, but had volunteered and been sent through him. Others had received part of their training at Fort Wayne. Furthermore during this period Loehe personally gave little or no instruction, Bauer and others doing that at Nuernberg, though they were in agreement with Loehe's view. Attention may also be called to Sihler's rather ungracious judgment, that while about one-third of the Missouri pastors were Nothhelfer, weight was more significant than numbers and, except for only one of them, they did not belong to the counseling, teaching and leading forces of synod, Lutheraner XI, 12, 88, 89. In a farewell letter to Sievers, Loehe wrote that they allowed others to read and think for them. Cited from G. J. Fritschel, op. cit., 227.

Loehe gave no further support to Missouri, but that body was now well able to prosper without it. Its institutions were strong enough to stand on their own feet and to supply the men needed. Before long the synod was able to found a teachers' seminary of its own. The colonies and their flourishing churches were retained. Loehe did not feel that his past efforts had been wasted, but the defection from his cause occasioned a sense of loss which he felt keenly. His support in the future was given to the group which moved to Iowa. The Gesellschaft went on, but increasingly Loehe's personal interests shifted to the inner mission enterprises which it initiated and conducted in Germany. Generous support still went to America, but after the first few years the direction tended to shift into the hands of Bauer.

CHAPTER III

ESTABLISHMENT: THE IOWA SYNOD

In mid-summer 1853 Loehe inquired whether it would be possible to leave for Iowa during that year, pointing out that there were problems to be solved, such as sale of lands and of the Saginaw property and settlement of debts owed by the congregations, as well as Deindoerfer's release by Frankenhilf.[1] These problems were bothersome and perhaps a more satisfactory settlement of some of them could have been made, if the departure had been put off. But the Loehe group decided to leave in the fall, leaving Weege behind until the next year to wind up business matters. Grossmann was joined by two students, four remaining behind to cast their lots with Missouri.[2] Deindoerfer secured a release which was given with regret and disputed later, and withdrew from membership in the synod.[3] Amman sold his farm and joined the group with his family.

---

[1] Letter, Loehe - Grossmann, undated, Loehe Papers. It was written before August 15, since it mentions that day as a sailing date yet to come. Loehe seems to have thought it preferable to delay departure, he mentioned that relations between the seminary and the congregations would be difficult, but could be kept peaceful with good will.

[2] Beckel and Kraenzlein, the latter was a recent arrival and was destined eventually to find his way into the Missouri Synod. Grossmann later wrote that Cloeter was permitted to address the students, present the Missouri side of the controversy to them and warn them of the consequences of going to Iowa. Subsequently Missouri had charged Grossmann with trying to hold and win over all the students. But Grossmann foreseeing the necessity of converting the seminary into a theological institution, and believing that only two of the students showed the requisite capacities had tried to hold only two and had succeeded with both. This was written ten years later. K. B. VI, 1, 4.

Joined by a few other individuals the group finally numbered twenty or twenty-two persons;[4] besides personal belongings they took a bell and vestments, which had been intended for Frankenhilf, but were property of the German patrons.[5] They divided into two parties, one, consisting of

---

[3] Letter, Deindoerfer - Loehe and Bauer, undated, Loehe Papers. Deindoerfer defended himself against charges that he deserted his congregation, quoting minutes of a congregational meeting in support. He asked for his release because of the quarrels over the status of the congregation, received it with regret and was asked to apply to Missouri for a new pastor. While some may have regretted his departure at the time, others had a change of heart after learning that Missouri could not or would not give them a pastor of their own. Deindoerfer asserted that he was then asked to reconsider and refused. He wrote that Missouri held that he should have presented his case to the synod, before asking for his release, but that he could not see a good reason for this, because Missouri pastors had stirred up the quarrels in question. Besides this would have delayed his dismissal and left him isolated after Grossmann's departure. As to his withdrawal from the synod, this was apparently not sent in until after he arrived in Iowa. He reports that he wrote it and then inadvertently packed it with his papers. The story of his running away was destined to have a long life.

[4] Grossmann's and Deindoerfer's families numbered eight including four children and Grossmann took a maid. There were two students, one of whom took his mother. Two single men are mentioned, Weger and Bender, and a brother of Deindoerfer apparently also single and Amman's numerous family, the exact size of which is not given. The number twenty to twenty-two is given by Deindoerfer, K. B. XLVII, 4, 39. A list and the names of the single men are in a letter Leonard Hahn - Loehe, Detroit, October 18, 1853, Loehe Papers.

[5] Dr. Sihler wrote to the following effect: when Deindoerfer was able to persuade only one member of his congregation to go along, he sneaked away without giving valid

Grossmann's family and a maid and of Deindoerfer's family, numbering nine persons, traveled in a wagon drawn by a team they had purchased, to Detroit, thence to Chicago by train and from there to Dubuque by team again. The larger group went by boat to Detroit, from there to Freeport, Illinois, the terminus of the railway, by train and on to Dubuque with a rented team. None of the group had much money and financial misunderstandings complicated matters,[6] with the result that the smaller party, following behind the larger which had already reached Dubuque, spent its last cent in payment of the ferry fare across the Mississippi and arrived literally

---

reasons then or later and took along bells, altar vestments, etc., which belonged to the congregation. Lutheraner XI, 12, 92. The myth of the theft of the bell has lived down to the present. Loehe inquired about the bell as early as the undated letter to Grossmann in summer 1853.

[6] Amman had sold his farm, getting little more cash than needed to pay debts. He considered waiting until spring, but heard from Weege that there was money in the seminary treasury and planned to borrow what he needed through Grossmann. Deindoerfer and Grossmann apparently lacked cash, but intended to borrow from Weege, who had also sold a farm. They left before that sale was consummated, however, hoping to be able to borrow from Amman, whom they supposed to have money from his sale. They did not discuss the matter until they met in Chicago during the journey and then tried to borrow from each other. They then had to distribute their slender funds as best they could leaving the smaller party, travelling with its own team, short. Letter, Grossmann - Loehe, Dubuque, October 25, 1853, Loehe Papers, K. B. VI, 3, 20.

penniless.[7] With some difficulty[8] they cashed a draft on Loehe for $350 to supply themselves with funds for a new beginning.[9] The baggage had to remain in Freeport until these funds were available. The journey was made in the first half of October 1853.[10]

After the delay in Dubuque, the group divided again. Grossmann and the students remained in Dubuque. They had not intended to remain there, but lack of money made it seem inadvisable to take the entire group to the colony, which was to be founded in Clayton County. Word had come from Loehe that six additional students were to embark from Germany in August[11] and notice that they were to go to Dubuque, had been sent to New York, in compliance with which they arrived early in November.[12] It was intended to continue the seminary and some of the men at least were to be trained as teachers, although the need for pastors was soon to lead to the introduction of theological work and in the course of the next few years, even the men first trained as teachers took additional work and entered the ministry.[13] The original purpose was to take the seminary into the proposed colony as soon as possible, locating it there temporarily until developments should suggest a permanent location, but Grossmann soon came to feel that Dubuque was the place for it and secured Loehe's consent to keep it there.[14]

---

[7] At the last stopping place, they were prepared to pawn watches, but what they thought was their last money paid the bill exactly. When they arrived at the ferry, the maid found a half dollar in a pocket where it had been forgotten. The ferry charge was half a dollar. Ibid., 21.

[8] They had written to arrange for drawing on Loehe through a New York bank, but were not sure that the arrangement had been perfected. They were, of course, total strangers in Dubuque. Two banks refused to accept their draft. At the third, the banker, Jessup, informed them that a man, whose name he gave, had been inquiring about them for some time, but had left the day before, recommending them highly. They told their story and received an advance of $150 and after due inquiries the draft was honored. Neither Grossmann, nor any other member of the party had ever heard of anyone by the name given nor could he be identified from data which inquiries elicited. In the oral tradition of the Iowa Synod the incident is often given a providential slant, which is reflected in G. J. Fritschel, Aus den Tagen der Vater, 120-124. Jessup was a faithful friend and adviser throughout the early years.

[9] In a letter, Grossmann - Loehe, Dubuque, October 25, 1853, the financial dilemma is explained and the draft reported. Grossmann offered repayment from his own property if funds were not available or to pay interest at 7 to 10 per cent.

[10] A letter, Leonard Hahn - Loehe, Detroit, October 18, 1853, Loehe Papers, gives October 3 as the date of departure from Detroit. They may have started from Saginaw in late September. The writer could not find a record of the date of arrival.

---

[11] Letter, Loehe - Grossmann, undated, in Loehe Papers, to which reference has already been made in connection with Loehe's ideas on the departure from Saginaw.

[12] K. B. VI, 5, 35. November 3 is given as the date of arrival and Grossmann states that the house was equipped in time to begin work on November 10.

[13] *Ibid.* Grossmann stated that the purpose was to establish a theological seminary, but he wrote this ten years later. Loehe referred to it as a teachers' seminary, but said that he was sending a second teacher, who was to open a Latin school which might serve as a preparatory school for younger men, who were to go into theological training, K. M. 1854, 4, 27, 28. A letter, Grossmann - Loehe, February 10, 1854, type copy in I. S. D. lists five students and says they were all preparing to teach.

Immediately, however, the problem was eking out an existence. When the Clayton County group left Dubuque, Beckel, who had completed the Saginaw course, opened a school in Dubuque, renting two rooms for the purpose.[15] He lived there with his mother and Grossmann with his family moved in with them to save expenses. When the student group from Germany arrived, a house was rented to serve as dormitory, seminary building, and church for a mission which Grossmann had already begun to gather, and Grossmann left Beckel's rooms and to live with the students. Lumber was bought and the students constructed furniture. An American pastor noticed while calling, that Grossmann's study had been equipped to serve as chapel for the mission and suggested use of the courthouse. Arrangements were then made to use that building when it was available.[16] Dubuque thus rather unintentionally developed into a center where a mission, a school and a seminary were conducted in the interests of an incipient church body.

---

[14] K. B. VI, 5, 35. Loehe does not mention the matter directly, but repeats Grossmann's account of the importance of Dubuque and refers to the city as the site of the seminary, K. M. 1854, 4, 27, 29.

[15] To induce parents to send children, instruction was offered gratis for one month, thereafter each child was to pay a monthly tuition of half a dollar. The school opened with Grossmann's daughter as the only pupil, during November the number grew to ten. K. M. 1854, 4, 31.

[16] Grossmann reports these details K. B. VI, 5, 35, 36. Deindoerfer's anniversary article corroborates most of them. K. B. XLVII, 5, 52.

Deindoerfer and Amman in the meantime were laying the small beginnings of a projected colony in Clayton County. Amman bought land in the rural area, a few miles northwest of Strawberry Point which still is known as St. Sebald, the name given the congregation the next year, commemorating a church in Nuernberg. He immediately began to build a house, while Deindoerfer and his family rented a house in Elkader, ten to fifteen miles distant, and constructed furniture. In December Amman was ready to move, Deindoerfer first taking quarters in an abandoned log cabin, nearer Strawberry Point and finally living for the rest of the winter in a space which Amman partitioned off for him in his house. During the winter Deindoerfer was building his own house, into which, still unfinished, he moved in the spring, it serving also as the church.[17] He had also purchased eighty acres of land for the church.

Through the winter Deindoerfer was taking colonization and dependence on Germany for support for granted. He was also opposed to locating the seminary permanently at Dubuque, believing that a colony of which it should be a part could advantageously be located at Garnavillo, where there were many Germans and where cheap land was available.[18] Grossmann suggested that land for colonization was available near Dubuque also,[19] but Deindoerfer later agreed to the Dubuque location and the seminary colony received no further mention.[20] Financing had been difficult from the beginning and soon came to be of decisive importance. The Michigan colonization capital, not large at best,[21] could not be liquidated quickly and applied

---

[17] K. B. XLVII, 5, 52. This is Deindoerfer's account on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary. References scattered through contemporary letters attest its accuracy.

[18] Letter, Deindoerfer - Bauer, January 22, 1854, type copy in I. S. D. He emphasized that only lack of means kept

---

the seminary behind in Dubuque at all. Now Grossmann could see nothing else. Garnavillo was in the center of a large German population, easily accessible and might grow, indeed the seminary might contribute to its growth to importance, though Deindoerfer saw no advantage in location in a large city.

[19] Grossmann was somewhat hurt when Deindoerfer on a visit to Dubuque showed him the above letter, sealed, and when he later heard of the Garnavillo plans through his maid, to whom Deindoerfer's brother had gossiped, Grossmann - Loehe, February 10, 1854, type copy in I. S. D. Some strain apparently ensued, which soon led to an agreement, for another letter, Grossmann - Loehe, May 4, 1854, type copy in I. S. D., is written expressly to remove any impression of a serious rift which the earlier letter might have given and quotes at length from an exceedingly intimate and cordial letter Grossmann had just received from Deindoerfer. Difficulty of communication undoubtedly tended to promote cross purposes. In the letter to Bauer cited in footnote 18, Deindoerfer regretted that sixty miles separated him from Grossmann requiring two days travel time and thus nearly a week for a round trip and visit. He felt a great need for closer association, but it was he who must sacrifice the time, since Grossmann could not leave the seminary.

[20] Letter, Deindoerfer - Loehe, April 29, 1854, type copy in I. S. D. Deindoerfer wrote that he, Weege, and Amman now agreed, since a congregation could hardly be gathered in Dubuque without the seminary, a factor which he had not understood previously. If, however, the institution should become a theological seminary, then a teachers' seminary should be located in a smaller town with missionary significance with an eye to partial self-support.

[21] Greenholt, op. cit., estimates it at about $1,200, 146.

to new land purchases for immigrants into Iowa and in fact never was so applied. Amman bought his own land and so did later settlers. Deindoerfer bought the church property under the preemption act for $100 with a year's time to pay. He used money paid him by Weege as his wife's share of an estate to erect the building and was soon urging its repayment, as well as asking for support.[22]

When it became clear that no funds would be forthcoming for land purchases, Deindoerfer proposed that missions be established in suitable locations by purchasing land, erecting a building to serve both as church and parsonage, supplying necessary stock, tools, and equipment and furnishing support for the first year, and paying for breaking the land, the total would run to approximately $1,000. In German Gulden this sum would be two and one-half times as high, but the purchasing power of the dollar was no greater in America than that of the Gulden in Germany.[23]

---

[22] Deindoerfer - Loehe, May 13, 1854, type copy in I. S. D. Loehe had written several letters, which no longer are available, but which complained of improper accounting and questioned such matters as the purchase of the team in Michigan and Deindoerfer's building without authority. Deindoerfer in reply points out that the Michigan finances were involved, and suggests how discrepancies might have arisen. The team was an absolute necessity and now rendered vital services in Dubuque and at St. Sebald. Necessity of lodging the party in Dubuque while waiting for the draft, consumed a considerable part of the funds. Part of the money was lent to Amman for building (this is mentioned in the earlier letter of January 22.) Deindoerfer himself received $59 beyond his expenses and received $200 later from his father-in-law, which belonged to his wife. All this and more had been spent on building and living costs. He needed shelter for his family and thus could not submit plans and estimates, but he described the building as it stood. It would cost not more than $275 when finished, because he and the team did so much of the work and would do more. The house should be completed by fall and the land payment met in December. He would prefer, not to have to ask for support and let it all go to the seminary, but why train more workers when those already in the field could not live? He made no estimate of his needs, but asked for funds to pay his debt, secure and improve the property and break the land. A letter, Grossmann - Loehe, May 4, 1854, type copy in I. S. D., acknowledged receipt of $460 of which $100 was for Deindoerfer.

Deindoerfer thus was abandoning the older idea of settling solid groups of German immigrants in colonies. Instead he proposed to endow mission parishes, which might be established wherever the number of unchurched Lutherans might justify. He was still envisaging a dependent relationship to Germany, whence the funds would flow. In a relatively

---

[23] Letter, Deindoerfer - Loehe, April 29, 1854, type copy in I. S. D. The recommendations are reported as coming from the colonization committee, consisting of himself, Weege and Amman. They do not give a total sum, but present various estimates.

Land	$100
Parsonage-church building	275 - 300
Furnishings	45
Horse, wagon, harness, saddle	135
Tools and implements	20
Cow	25 - 30
Pigs	4
Supplies for first year	8 - 10 per month
Clothing for first year	100

To this Deindoerfer adds breaking soil at $3 per acre (in the letter of May 13 referred to in footnote 22.)

The committee recommended purchase of eighty acres of land, partly woodland, the price would hold only where preemption at $1.25 per acre was still possible. The house was to be a story and a half structure 24 x 18, with a wing serving as church and school and the second story room was to be finished for a seminarian serving an internship with the pastor. A good deal of the work was to be done by the occupant. Supplies were to take the place of a salary.

new country, missionary pastors thus would receive a measure of the security, the lack of which he himself was feeling intensely.[24]

Colonization or endowment of missions, either alternative called for relatively large sums of money which German sources would have to supply. Loehe had never carried on such activities on a scale sufficiently large to support an entire church body. If he were to do so now, a much greater volume of support would be required than ever before. The breach with Missouri, however, had an adverse effect on Loehe's sources of income for missionary purposes. Loehe publicly made only guarded and moderate statements about the rupture, but letters from immigrants were less conservative, provoking a gloomy disillusionment which stifled the desire to contribute to the American causes.[25] In addition Loehe's growing interest in domestic inner missions was soon to give a new and more popular outlet to the missionary impulses which he had nurtured.

---

[24] The estimates in the preceding footnote were based on his own undertakings and requirements. The next letter of May 13 indicates that he was having a hard struggle for existence, intensified by uncertainty in regard to reimbursement. See footnote 22. The letter with the estimates points out that the improvements would soon create a value at least equal to the total investment, but does not suggest repayment into a revolving fund.

[25] Letter, Loehe - Deindoerfer, Neuendettelsau, July 4, 1854, in Deindoerfer Papers. Loehe said directly that colonization in the old sense was now impossible. If schools or churches were to be built, that could be done only, if definite plans and estimates were furnished in advance.

When a party of immigrants destined to Iowa arrived in 1854 the idea of settling in a body to form a Lutheran community was still strong. A plan to buy lands near Dyersville from banker Jessup was considered,[26] but not carried out. Some of the immigrants went to St. Sebald, but not all shared Deindoerfer's enthusiasm for wooded hills.[27] In the course of the next few years St. Sebald, although not a colony like those in Michigan, grew and prospered, and developed as a community centering around its church with deep spiritual and ecclesiastic loyalties. It was for years to hold a pre-eminent place among the congregations of the Iowa Synod and although its numbers have long since been dwarfed by numerous other churches, the old loyalties are still strong and the old traditions still alive.

In the summer of 1854 this development lay in the future. Until some of the arrivals of that year came to St. Sebald, Deindoerfer's flock consisted of his own and Amman's family and of students who were sent to his assistance and placed in his charge by the seminary.[28] In the spring of 1854, his father-in-law, Weege also arrived. He felt his isolation keenly,[29] especially in midwinter, when building had to cease and two families were crowded into Amman's house, and when weather made it impossible to go farther afield in mission work, but he rejoiced that now at least he had an opportunity for study and set up a regular program for himself and the student who was then with him.[30] He had from the beginning conducted services on Sunday, now he had daily morning and evening services[31] and preached also on Wednesdays and Fridays. He frequently pondered mission opportunities in Elkader and Garnavillo and Elkport in his county, but even in the spring, poverty and pressing work gave him little opportunity to do mission work.[32]

---

[26] Deindoerfer was not enthusiastic about this, there was no woodland and costs would run $10 to $15 per acre. On this occasion he said definitely that no new colonies should be attempted, let people settle where they will and follow them with missions, lest they should feel that the interests of the pastors were served at their expense, letter, Deindoerfer - Loehe, May 13, 1854, in I. S. D.

[27] Possibly the last statement in the preceding footnote is a veiled allusion to this.

---

[28] Beck and Wilke, the latter having the ministry in view. The former wished to become a colonist with an Indian mission and later did.

[29] Letter, Deindoerfer - Bauer, January 22, 1854. Besides the difficulty of associating with Grossmann, already noted, he lamented the complete breaking off of friendships in Michigan, extending to the ostracism of relatives still there. However, he did not regret his position. At times he had been tempted to think that perhaps affection for his teachers blinded him to the truth, but comparison of Scriptures with Walther's position had dispelled such thinking.

[30] The studies included the catechism, church history, dogmatics, the book of Acts with special reference to the doctrine of the Church and ministry, and practical exegesis. Ibid.

[31] Gottesdienst (service) is the word used, not Andacht (devotion). Ibid.

[32] Letter, Deindoerfer - Loehe, May 13, 1854, already cited.

In Dubuque meanwhile the seminary was still training teachers and the activities begun in the fall were going forward with increasing attendance.[33] Finances were tight there also.[34] Grossmann located a nearby German settlement, but like Deindoerfer was unable to give it regular care. In mid-summer, however, assistance arrived. From Neuendettelsau came Pastor Sigmund Fritschel, who was to open a Latin school at the seminary and to become second teacher at the seminary, and Candidate M. Schueller, who hoped to do mission work among the Indians.[35] While a number of younger students intended for the Latin school had been prevented from coming, there was also an additional student for the seminary.[36] A considerable group of immigrants arrived at the same time, having banded together as a congregation en route to form a nucleus of laity.[37] With their arrival began a period of significant activity.

---

[33] K. M. 1854, 5, Beiblatt, 46, 47. At first only their own group attended the services, since Christmas attendance had been growing, now there were more than twenty. This gave excellent prospects to the school. From a letter by Grossmann, not identified, but written between Christmas and Lent.

[34] In available letters Grossmann says little about money, in February he reported that he put $300 which he realized from the sale of the Michigan land in which he was interested with Weege into the treasury to cover a deficit. However, one could live cheaply as compared with Michigan, January household bills were only $13.55, letter Grossmann - Loehe, February 10, 1854, previously cited.

[35] K. M. 1854, 6, 46-48, gives a brief account of their careers and notes their designations.

[36] Military training laws in Bavaria interfered with the coming of the younger students. The seminarian, Duerr, soon proved a misfit. S. Fritschel Tagebuch.

Loehe had been suggesting the formation of a synod to Grossmann for some time.[38] Apparently the reason was that it was difficult to maintain a relationship in which the burden of support rested upon German supporters while decisions involving them necessarily had to be made by the men on the spot where the work was being carried on. As has been noted the burden of support was difficult in the best of cases. With confused accounting because of distance and unavoidable complications, bookkeeping was becoming snarled and the German leaders found it difficult to give either exact statements or reliable estimates to the Gesellschaft. American letters were full of plans or requests involving heavy commitments, while temporarily at least revenues were diminishing. Under these circumstances Loehe seems to have become convinced that the enterprise in Iowa could not be managed from Germany.

---

[37] The immigrants had formed a ship congregation and had called S. Fritschel as their pastor, who was ordained on the strength of that call, ordination certificate, S. Fritschel Documents. They had a dreary passage of sixty-eight days, lost and recovered baggage in New York, experienced a railway wreck in Canada in which four of their party were killed and several injured. S. Fritschel then fell ill with cholera, of which a deadly epidemic was raging, while still looking after the interests of the immigrants in Canada. He managed to get to Detroit, where he recovered. S. Fritschel Tagebuch.

[38] The letter in which he first broached the matter is not available. Apparently it was written in April 1854. See next footnote and K. M. 1856, 10 and 11, 88. Deindoerfer denied a German impression that St. Sebald was badly located.

The solution must be that the men in the field form their own organization and assume the responsibility, while the Gesellschaft would pledge general support within its means and would continue to furnish manpower, but would not assume specific obligations, or at most only to a limited degree.[39]

Neither Deindoerfer, nor Grossmann liked the proposal. Both had, since their arrival in America, been in a dependent relationship and both confronted difficulties, which made its continuance attractive.[40] They could see the problem which faced the Gesellschaft, but felt that independence should be postponed.[41] Loehe, however, persisted and in September definitely asked that at least a temporary organization be formed to which the Michigan property could be transferred and gave suggestions as to doctrinal position and relationship to other synods.[42] In the meantime the new arrivals had doubled the number of pastors and word had come that another candidate was on the way. A conference of these men, scheduled for Dubuque, met various difficulties and finally began on August 24 at St. Sebald.[43]

---

[39] These motives can be established from remarks by Grossmann in a reply, Grossmann - Loehe, May 4, 1854, type copy in I. S. D., and by Deindoerfer in the previously cited letter of May 13 to Loehe. The latter specifically mentions the difficulty of keeping accurate accounts. See also the complaints from Germany noted in footnote 22. A letter, Loehe - Deindoerfer, July 4, 1854, in the Deindoerfer papers suggests that with the increase in number through the coming men, organization should be possible and that he himself and his associates could not assume personal risks. He says, however, that the Gesellschaft had not yet adopted a resolution on these matters.

[40] They expressed their hesitations in the letters cited in the preceding footnote. Grossmann said that the proposal saddened him and that he preferred the old relationship. Deindoerfer believed it was too early and that the accounts could be cleared.

[41] They seem to have felt that organization of congregations was not sufficiently advanced. Loehe in the letter cited in the following footnote, wrote that in Germany they thought it necessary to form a synod at once whether or not congregations take part.

Four men, G. Grossmann, J. Deindoerfer, S. Fritschel and M. Schueller on that day agreed to join in forming the Evangelical Lutheran Iowa Synod and continued their session as such through the next day. They agreed to postpone drawing up a constitution, because of the difficulty of doing so on the one hand, and of its importance on the other, and also to seek advice from the German fathers first. A significant confessional position was taken, the declaration reading in translation:

---

[42] Letter, Loehe - Grossmann, September 16, 1854, in I. S. D. Apparently this letter is written on behalf of the Gesellschaft. He suggested taking the Book of Concord as provisional basis, with a definition of their Richtung as formulated in earlier instructions. Statements on relationships to Missouri and Buffalo had best be omitted since Missouri would probably not recognize them in any case, and an attempt at a definition might lead to difficulties. Further suggestions would follow later.

[43] Deindoerfer was seriously ill, as a result of exposure during building operations. There was illness in Grossmann's family and a son died on the appointed day. Fritschel accompanied by Beckel had in the meantime set out on foot toward St. Sebald according to an emergency agreement and, not being met, had returned to Dubuque. Amman finally drove in and after the Grossmann funeral took the Dubuque party to St. Sebald. Deindoerfer was in bed during the session in an adjoining room. Shortly after the return another child of Grossmann's died, S. Fritschel Tagebuch.

> a. "The Synod accepts all the symbols of the Lutheran Church and does so because it recognizes all the symbolical decisions in regard to the controversies which arose in the period of the Reformation as being in accordance with the Divine Word.
>
> b. "Since there are several Richtungen (attitudes[44]) within the Lutheran Church, it declares itself in accordance with that one which seeks to attain a greater perfection of the church by means of an interpretation of the symbols in harmony with the Divine Word."[45]

Principles in general terms were laid down for formation of congregations, requiring conformity to synodical principles in regard to doctrine and discipline, and reestablishing the

---

[44] Because it is difficult to find an exact English equivalent, the term Richtung will be used and the paragraph in which it occurs will be referred to as the Richtung paragraph. Literally the word means direction, such terms as "position" or "attitude" approximate its meaning here. The paragraph gives the Iowa attitude that progress toward perfection was possible in Lutheran theology, and that the symbols must be interpreted according to the Scriptures. By contrast the Missouri attitude had a tendency to assert that Lutheran doctrine had attained complete development during the Reformation period and that Lutherans interpret Scriptures according to the symbols and not the symbols according to Scriptures, or that Lutherans in controversy with other Lutherans use the symbols, but Scriptures only in controversy with non-Lutherans.

[45] The German version reads:

> a. "Die Synode bekennt sich zu den saemmtlichen Symbolen der Lutheran Kirche, u. zwar deshalb, weil sie die saemmtlichen symbolischen Entscheidungen fuer die in der Reformationszeit aufgekommenen Streitfragen als dem goettlichen Worte entsprechend erkennt.
>
> b. "Da es innerhalb der Lutheran Kirche verschiedene Richtungen givt, so bekennt sie sich hiemit zu derjenigen, welche auf dem Wege der Symbole an der Hand des

catechumenate of the old Christian Church for purposes of probation. An offer from the Gesellschaft to turn over seminary and Latin school to the synod was gratefully acknowledged but declined, despite a further offer to give all possible support to it, on the ground that the synod in its present circumstances could contribute almost nothing toward its support.[46]

Thus, somewhat hesitantly, a synod was founded which in the early period was officially named the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Iowa. The founders acted on the advice, if not at the request, of their supporters in Germany whom they long were to call "the fathers." Clearly their suggestions were adopted in almost every detail[47] and for lack of experience here and of further suggestions from abroad the

---

goettlichen Wortes einer groesseren Vollendung der Kirche entgegenstrebt."

[46] All data in this paragraph are from a document entitled: "Kurzer Bericht ueber die im August 1854 Geschehene Constituirung der Evangelisch Lutherischen Synode von Iowa," in I. S. D. A second title on the inside indicates that the report was to the Gesellschaft. The ms. document is evidently a copy. Signatures of all four founders are appended, but are all in one hand. No official minutes of the meeting are now available. Deindoerfer in his anniversary article K. B. XLVII, 6, 66 writes that he used them in writing his Geschichte during the preceding decade, but that they now could no longer be found. Since none of the early synodical minutes are now among the I. S. D., though references indicate that they were kept, it must be assumed that all were lost.

[47] It may be noted that the suggestions by Loehe given in footnote 43 are incorporated although that letter was not written until September 16, Loehe evidently not yet having received word of the organization. Doubtless other letters were lost. Oral instructions or suggestions may also have been sent with the party that arrived in July.

organization was rudimentary. No constitution was adopted until 1864. The Synod consisted of but four pastors, and there were but two congregations, both as yet in the incipient stages[48] and a few prospective missions. There was a seminary, but no constituency to support it. One or perhaps two of the four members were desirous of serving as missionaries to the Indians.[49] Prospects were inviting and opportunities for service almost unlimited. Practical problems were burdensome and threatened to hamper at every step the realization of opportunities.

---

[48] A congregation had been organized in Dubuque, and perhaps another at St. Sebald. Deindoerfer, Geschichte, gives 1854 as the date for both without indication of the month, but lists St. Sebald first, p. 346. A pamphlet "Diamond Jubilee St. John's Lutheran Church, Dubuque, Iowa, 1854-1939" states that Grossmann and the students organized themselves into a congregation soon after arrival in 1853 and that the name was adopted in the spring of 1854 after the admission of other members. K. M. 1854, 4 corroborates the statement about Grossmann, p. 27, and reports formal organization of a congregation 1855, 10, 59 as having taken place on Whitsunday 1854. It also reported 1854, 4, 28 that Deindoerfer had organized a small organization in Elkader late in 1853. For Elkader this cannot be true, but it may refer to family organization in St. Sebald similar to the seminary organization in Dubuque.

[49] Schueller, supra p. 43. S. Fritschel, infra ch. 9.

CHAPTER IV

FOUNTAIN: THE SEMINARY 1854-1864

The Iowa Synod at its organization meeting had refused to take over the seminary, because it felt that the synod would be able to contribute very little to its support. The total expenses incurred for maintaining this institution up to the end of the year 1854 were approximately $1,000, about $400 of which accrued in the months following the organization.[1] Only about $20 of this had been raised within the Synod, while approximately $800 had come from Neuendettelsau.[2]

---

[1] Document entitled: *Seminarrechnung fuer die Zeit vom 29 October 1853, dem Tage des Beginns unseres eigenen Haushaltes bis zum 31. December, 1854*, in I. S. D. Expenses are not listed in great detail, there being three main headings, *Haushaltkasse, Laut Tagebuch, Licht*. The first probably included only or mainly board and ran to somewhat more than $350. The second must have included rent and miscellaneous supplies and ran somewhat below $500. Light cost about $30. In addition firewood cost $58.50 and a maid was paid $1 a week.

Another document, *Haupt-Rechnung ueber saemmtliche Einnahmen und Ausgaben in Iowa vom 12. October 1853,--23. August, 1854*, in I. S. D. lists total seminary bills to that time as $626.19.

[2] Computed from *Seminarrechnung*. Since $1,500 for purchase of the house is included, the total for the period coming from Germany is much larger. Another item of $100 may also have come from there.

A third document, *Seminarrechnung fuer die Zeit vom 29. October 1853, dem Tag des Beginnes uns. eig. Haushalts bis zum 31. October 1854*, in I. S. D. makes it clear that almost all of the $20 raised in America was raised after the organization of Synod. The dates in the title are misleading, the entire period through December 1854 is also covered. A considerable debt had been incurred, part of it, however, was applied to other purposes.

With the addition of a second teacher and the organization of a Latin school, the expenses were likely to rise.[3] Extraordinary expenses also were in prospect during August 1854, because the acquisition of a building was being contemplated.

Purchase of the house which the seminary had rented would save the monthly rental, which amounted to $12 and was raised to $14. and thus accounted for a considerable percentage of the total cost, it would also make possible the erection of an addition which would serve as church for the congregation, desirable because the court house was not always available.[4] The house was for sale at $1,500, which might be borrowed through the fathers in Germany and ultimately raised through the sale of the Michigan properties. A donation of land and also contributions toward building costs were in prospect locally.[5] Banker Jessup was ready to aid in the consummation of these plans and the community was interested in the seminary, and the group at the seminary felt that it should try to reach the English as well as the German population. Perhaps when they had learned English they might be able to teach at the existing college. There was also a "female academy" in the city, in which they had learned that there would definitely be a place for an educated and accomplished German lady.[6]

---

[3] None of the three accounts make any mention of payment of salary, but the second shows loans to Grossmann "zur Bestreitung der noethigsten Beduerfnisse" of $61.76, also recording a loan from him to the treasury of $300. (See footnote 35, ch. 3.) The third document no longer shows this loan by Grossmann among the receipts, although it does show borrowings of nearly $800, but lists the total lent to him at $142. He received board and room, probably according to the terms of the original agreement at Saginaw. (See footnote 35, ch. 1.) It may be noted that Deindoerfer received $384.75 "zu Hausbau, Einrichtung, Unterhalt."

[4] K. B. VI, 5, 36, and 7, 50, 51. The latter reference states that Jessup advanced $800 for such an addition, pending receipt of this amount from Germany. When it did not come, the loan was repaid by borrowing from a student who had means. The accounts above show no trace of such a transaction, except that $360 was borrowed from student Kraenzlein. The rest may have been repaid, however.

Fritschel wrote to Germany asking for the $1,500 but while the reply was being awaited, the price of the house was increased by $200. Since it stood in need of repairs this seemed too much.[7] An opportunity arose immediately to buy another house in a downtown location for $2,000. Jessup was consulted again, failed to get a reduction of the price, but after inspection pronounced the house worth the price. He had arranged with the owner that half of the purchase price be paid down, and the other a year later. He agreed to lend the money for the down payment, if Grossmann did not receive a remittance in time.[8] Grossmann accepted this offer and the terms and the purchase was made. At Neuendettelsau in the meantime, treasuries were being emptied and funds borrowed to raise the $1,500 which had been requested.[9] When the remittance arrived, $1,000 was used for the down payment, the rest going toward the payment of debts.[10] Thus the seminary acquired a home of its own, a brick structure of eight rooms, with a wooden addition, on which there remained a debt of $1,000, due in a year's time at an interest rate of 10 per cent.[11]

---

[5] S. Fritschel Tagebuch, entered under July 28. Prospective donation of three lots is not entirely clear. Apparently Jessup was willing to give them, but his lots were poorly located. He offered instead to try to induce the owner of a high, prominent location to make a gift of them and to start off a drive for funds with a liberal donation himself. It is not clear just what was to be erected there, perhaps a church.

[6] Ibid. He reported to Germany about the "female seminary." An undated fragment of a letter, G. Fritschel - S. Fritschel, type copy in I. S. D., states that the idea appealed very much in Germany. A letter, Bauer - S. Fritschel reports a deaconess-trained woman en route, who might serve for a girls' school.

[7] Jessup had offered to try to get the price reduced by $100. S. Fritschel Tagebuch. Grossmann wrote ten years later

---

that the house rented had first been offered for $1,300, K. B. VI, 5, 36. This may be an error, or possibly the price was raised twice.

[8] Letter, Grossmann - Loehe, September 3, 1854, type copy in I. S. D. Grossmann estimated the value of the lot alone at $900. He noted that there was also a barn with space for two cows and room for another of similar capacity. The purchase on such short notice was probably affected by the consideration that the house actually occupied was for sale, and could be leased only subject to short time termination.

[9] Letter written by Loehe, dated 1855, in I. S. D. (it bears a notation in English, September 11, 1855), describes the difficulty of raising the money. An earlier letter, Loehe - Grossmann, Deindoerfer, Fritschel, Doerfler, Schueller, September 16, 1854, type copy in I. S. D., promised the remittance and instructed them to buy the house in which they were. Loehe could not yet have received Grossmann's letter of September 3.

[10] K. B. VI, 5, 36, 37. Payment of the debts with the excess must have been an afterthought, or caused by pressing necessity. In the letter of September 3, he had requested that the extra $500 be sent as soon as possible to save interest.

[11] Jessup had promised to pay 10 per cent on a deposit toward the debt, instead of the usual 6 per cent. Usual bor-

During most of October the seminary activities were suspended while students and teachers were cleaning, painting and digging a basement and a cistern.[12] In the next year an addition was constructed to serve as church for the local congregation. The need for this had become more pressing and since there was an open space on the seminary lot, it seemed advisable to meet it in this way. The synod agreed to let the congregation have the space,[13] the expectation being that in time the congregation would grow and would then build a larger church elsewhere, while by that time the seminary would probably need the space in the addition. The brick structure cost approximately $1,500, of which all but about 10 per cent represented an additional debt which the congregation was to assume.[14]

---

rowing rate was 18 per cent, letter cited in footnote 8.

[12] _K. M._ 1855, 2, 15.

[13] _Ibid._, 10, 80. The congregation asked the synod to sell the space. The synod agreed to let Grossmann determine the cost price and do so. _Ibid._, 1856, 6 and 7, 50. The parsonage of St. John's still occupies the site.

[14] _Ibid._, 1856, 10, 81. Grossmann, noting the heavy interest burden, appealed for private gifts to aid the congregation.

By the time the structure was completed, the loss of the entire property was threatening. The payment of the purchase price in 1854 had exhausted the resources of the Gesellschaft.[15] It was no longer possible to contribute much toward the maintenance of the seminary. A time came when the treasury was empty.[16] For a month the seminary had to be closed, the students being assigned positions as teachers, Fritschel going to friends on a farm and Grossmann apparently remaining in charge of the congregation at Dubuque, which was able to make some contribution to his support. A sum of money then arrived from another German source, which made it possible to recall both Fritschel and some of the students.[17] The situation had been reported to Neuendettelsau. In reply the Gesellschaft regretfully released Grossmann from his obligations in regard to the seminary economy. He was to keep the institution open as long as possible, but was authorized to resign if necessary, as was S. Fritschel. The Gesellschaft would do its utmost to help, but could not promise to give as much as might be needed. If the remainder of the purchase price could not be raised, the synod was to have a free hand to sell. In that case the brethren might take the students into their homes and instruct them privately.[18]

---

[15] Ibid., 9, 71. Loehe wrote that they had originally believed that they could support the seminary without difficulty. But after incurring debts during the previous year which were as yet unpaid, new debts had to be incurred. They could not borrow yet a third time. However, this reference is probably to the sum finally borrowed to meet the second payment.

[16] K. B. VI, 5, 37. Grossmann recalls a time when only black coffee and dry bread could be served and they only because a few servant girls had contributed a few dollars, lest the seminarians go hungry.

[17] Ibid., 37. Dubuque salary, K. M. 1855, 10, 82. The source of the funds is not given.

When the Iowa Synod met in its second general convention late in September 1855 the offer to transfer the seminary into its possession was again considered.[19] Although the situation was precarious, and the obstacles of the previous year had not been removed it was decided to accept the offer. A treasury was established, under the name Synodalkasse, to provide for the maintenance of the school. Congregations holding membership in the synod were to be obliged to contribute to this treasury; congregations, not holding membership but served by pastors of the synod, were to be induced by them to make contributions. In addition all funds coming from Germany without specific designation were to go into it. Unable to support two teachers, Grossmann alone was to take charge and even he was promised only housing in the seminary for the present, though the treasury according to its capacity was to meet his needs.[20] The minutes are silent on the subject of the debt, now $1,100 with accrued interest. Sale had apparently been considered, but no buyer had appeared. A final appeal for help had been sent to Neuendettelsau. Grossmann reporting these facts offered to keep on going as long as possible and synod accepted this offer.[21] Neuendettelsau, however, met the emergency once more. Just before the synod met, word had been sent that a draft for $1,100 was being sent.[22] This money, apparently borrowed, arrived in the nick of time and the purchase was completed.[23] The seminary building thus became the debt free property of the synod, although there remained a debt on the addition which rested on St. John's congregation at Dubuque.[24]

---

[18] Document, Protokoll, Abtheilung I, Gesellschaft fuer innere Mission, June 28, 1855, in I. S. D., obviously a copy sent as official notice. It is signed by Stirner, chairman of section I and by three others and approved by Loehe.

[19] The minutes do not say that the offer had been renewed, but there had probably been further correspondence on the subject, although there is none preserved in the I. S. D., nor is there any other indication what the German reaction to the refusal of the previous year had been.

---

[20] The minutes are printed in K. M. 1856, 6 and 7, 41-52. Grossmann was eventually to draw a salary. A treasurer was appointed who was made responsible to pastoral conferences as well as synod. The data given are found on p. 49. Immediately following the offer of the Michigan properties was again declined, because of debts resting on them and because relations with the present administrator (Missouri pastor, F. Sievers) would be less intimate than they were with the fathers.

[21] K. B. VI, 5, 37, 38.

[22] Letter, Bauer - Grossmann, Neuendettelsau, September 21, 1855, in I. S. D. Synod met September 26 and 27. The payment was due October 20.

[23] K. B. VI, 5, 38. For borrowing see footnote 15. There is no evidence that synod had information that the attempt was being made to raise the money, but it seems probable from their decision to keep the seminary in operation that they had such information. Bauer's letter cited in the preceding note, does not sound as if he were springing a complete surprise.

The seminary was still training teachers, but it was now beginning to graduate pastors also.[25] In 1854, Beckel and Weege, both first graduated as teachers, reentered and took up theological studies. After the closing at Easter 1855, only these two returned when a month later work could again be begun, being instructed privately.[26] After Fritschel's arrival, a Latin school, the inception of a later college, was opened to prepare younger boys for entrance into the seminary. It drew a few students, both from America and from Germany and private instruction of these was also continued by Fritschel after the brief closing in 1855.[27]

---

[24] The greater share of the cost, however, had been advanced from the seminary treasury. Diamond Jubilee, St. John's, 10. How much was advanced and what the source had been, from which the seminary had received it, does not appear. In 1861 the synod took over the building, the lot payment had never been made. A debt of $1,000 remained. The congregation agreed to pay enough rent to cover the interest until it built a new church. Chronik, 55.

[25] In a letter written in 1854 from which excerpts are published K. M. 1855, 1, 3, S. Fritschel calls himself second teacher at the teachers' seminary. When in 1855 the seminary was closed the students were given teaching positions, Ibid., 10, 77, although some of them may have been in the early stages of theological training and all those named eventually became pastors. Correspondenz-blatt VI, 6, in June 1855 speaks of the institution as of a teachers' seminary which contains the beginnings of a theological seminary.

[26] Ibid., 1856, 1 and 2, 10. S. Fritschel, reporting there, says that Deindoerfer gave them practical training. They may have been with him for this purpose while the seminary was closed. Both completed their training during 1855, but Weege died shortly before graduation, Ibid., 1855, 10, 78, 79.

During the next year six students were reported as enrolled, two of whom were probably in the Latin school, with one prospect listed for entrance.[28] The seminary in 1855 followed a schedule which provided for opening chapel exercises at 7:00 A.M. and for closing devotions at 9:30-10:00 P.M. Class periods ran from 8:00 to 12:00 and 2:00 to 4:00 except on Wednesdays, when there were services and on Saturdays. The hours 7:00-9:30 P.M. were designated as study period. Only Biblical History and Catechism were listed as religious subjects, though languages, music and several secular subjects were taught.[29] This curriculum could indicate that most of the students were beginners or were then being prepared for teaching.[30] Examinations were held before the ministerium, the entire body of pastors assembled in conference. Some were apparently conducted by the teacher, but students were to prepare a written historical lecture, which some of them might be asked to deliver before the ministerium, which might ask pertinent questions.[31] By a slightly earlier account instruction suffered occasional interruptions when pastoral duties called the teachers away.[32]

---

[27] Grossmann's letter to Loehe, September 3, 1854, mentions entrance of a farm boy. In K. M. 1856, 1 and 2, 10, 11, Fritschel refers to two younger students and a later report, printed earlier, reports the death of one of them also. Ibid., 1855, 10, 77, 78. A German student is reported as enroute in a letter, Bauer - S. Fritschel, May 29, 1855, in I. S. D. S. Fritschel mentions that there were three students in 1854, K. M. 1855, 1, 3.

[28] K. M. 1855, 11, 87. Reported in a letter from Grossmann, dated February 4, 1856. The discrepancy in dates is due to the loss enroute of the minutes of synod of 1855 and probably other reports, causing the last two 1855 issues of K. M. to be delayed for lack of material into 1856, Ibid., 85.

[29] Ibid., 87, 88. The other subjects listed were: Latin, German, Greek, geography, penmanship, rhetoric, arithmetic, singing, piano. Among subjects for examinations world history was listed, see footnote 31.

Grossmann regretted the departure of S. Fritschel greatly. Since the synod had indicated that he would be recalled as soon as it would be possible to support him, he hoped that this might be soon.[33] Other pressures, however, intervened and attention was directed to Fritschel's younger brother, Gottfried, who after graduation from the Missionsanstalt had attended a German university.[34] The third convention of the synod in 1856 issued a call to him[35] and he arrived in May 1857.

---

[30] The names of two students who were sent out as teachers the preceding year do not appear, although both subsequently graduated. They may have kept their positions for a time or have been with Deindoerfer for practical training. With one exception all those listed eventually became pastors.

[31] Protokollbuch. Individual entries will be given in translation and abbreviated. Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, September 4-5, 1856. A colloquy was also held with Pastor Friedrichs of the Ohio Synod. He was asked to attend the seminary for a while, but refused.

[32] Letter, H. Weege - Deindoerfer, Dubuque, June 19, 20, 1855, Deindoerfer Papers. This referred to a time when only two students were being instructed privately, but it was probably not abnormal.

[33] K. M. 1855, 11, 87.

It may be doubted whether the financial situation really justified this step, however desirable it may have been from the point of view of the needs of the seminary. In 1855 students had received free board from members of St. John's at Dubuque.[36] The Synodalkasse receipts for the first year amounted to $120.25.[37] The synod had decided, however, in 1856 that synodical congregations were to raise offerings for the seminary on all the great festival days in order to provide a regular income.[38] A qualified return to the older idea of a seminary colony was also under consideration. If the seminary itself could acquire a farm and move on it, it should be possible to supply many of its needs from its own soil, thus greatly reducing living costs. Consideration was given to various possible locations. Unnamed locations in Minnesota and central Iowa seem to have had some supporters, but were not seriously considered.[39] More thought was given to the possibility of moving to Kansas, which then was receiving much attention and it seems that Grossmann advocated this. But an exploratory trip taken by some friends did not lead to favorable results. At a pastoral conference in St. Sebald, Kansas too was rejected and the decision was

---

[34] The financial difficulties of 1855-6 had the effect of casting uncertainty over his immediate future. At one time a plan of taking a temporary position in England was considered. Later there were negotiations with Pastor Grabau in regard to a position at Martin Luther College. Letters, G. Fritschel - S. Fritschel, Neuendettelsau, March 5, 1855, March 12, 1856, Fritschel Family Correspondence. He was the only one of the early emissaries who could speak English at the time of his arrival.

[35] Chronik der Synode von Iowa 1854-1893, 16. This work will hereafter be cited as Chronik. Grossmann reported to the pastoral conference in 1856 that he had written G. Fritschel to come at once, without formal call and take up his work in the fall of that year. Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, September 4-5, 1856. Nothing came of that.

[36] The cited letter, H. Weege - Deindoerfer, June 19, 20, 1855, mentioned that this arrangement was being planned at a time when there were but two students. Grossmann reports it in effect at a time when there were six, K. M. 1855, 11, 87. It is interesting that in the same letter Grossmann mentions, p. 86, that Neuendettelsau had at one time given them hope that they might expect up to $80 monthly for the seminary. A letter, G. Fritschel - S. Fritschel, November 23, 1854, in Fritschel Family Correspondence mentions that all the students at Neuendettelsau had spent their last vacation soliciting funds for Iowa.

[37] Document, Rechnungsabschluss fuer die Synodalkassa, vom 1 October: 1855 bis zum 4 Septbr: 1856, in I. S. D.

Included are offerings, individual gifts, rent, and an item of $18 which probably represents a student payment. No large item from Germany is included, indeed none at all, which definitely can be identified as coming from there. Corresponding expenses are given as $120.24, leaving a balance of $5.01. Since no item for heat is included it is not certain that the account is complete, although firewood might have been laid in before October 1. Saws and an ax handle occur. The account corroborates the absence of boarding arrangements in the seminary during that year.

[38] Chronik, 16.

[39] Letter, G. Fritschel - S. Fritschel, St. Sebald, undated, in Fritschel Family Correspondence. Reasons for rejection are given as, only preemption permitted for Minnesota, and no good woods and no government land for central Iowa. For Kansas he notes, no woods. He himself preferred to stay in Dubuque, where he was just planning to open an English college, for the local population.

reached to buy a farm at St. Sebald, to erect a building at a prominent location and to sell the property in Dubuque.[40]

It was thought that the proceeds of the sale of the Dubuque property would cover the costs. An actual offer of $6,000 had been received, but 1856 was a lush boom year and the synod were advised not to sell at once, by the next year it would be able to get $2,000 more.[41] A farm of 160 acres was bought, reputed to be one of the best in the vicinity, partly improved and partly woodland. With some stock and half the crop the price was $2,100. The seminary was to cost $2,000.[42] The conference had reached its decision in June and work began immediately. Grossmann with the older students went to St. Sebald, to labor on construction, while G. Fritschel remained to carry on in Dubuque with the younger group.[43]

---

[40] Chronik, 18. By way of reason it was stated that support from the Gesellschaft had dwindled and finally ceased. A number of the pastors were opposed to Kansas. A full scale colonization attempt in Kansas had been contemplated. A considerable area of land was to be bought up and reserved for Lutheran settlers, in the midst of whom the seminary would be located. Since land could be bought only under the preemption act, it was not possible to buy up a large area and hold it for a growing number of Lutheran settlers, K. M. 1857, 11, 83.

[41] K. B. VI, 7, 71. Grossmann had written to Germany a year earlier that early in 1856 the value of the seminary property had risen to $5,000, K. M. 1855, 11, 86.

[42] An undated letter of G. Fritschel cited in footnote 39 mentions $4,215 for 360 acres. Only half of the farm was bought. Data given are from K. M. 1857, 11, 84. The Fritschel family later acquired the other half.

[43] K. B. VI, 7, 51.

Some of the more advanced students, however, were sent to S. Fritschel, then in Detroit, to continue their studies.[44] Building made rapid progress, the students earning praise for energetic and willing work under difficult circumstances. Dedication took place October 31, 1857, most of the clergy attending it and a following pastoral conference.[45] The new seminary was a two story frame building 32 x 48, erected about two miles from the church at the highest point in the vicinity.[46] Total costs ran a little more than $2,000.[47]

---

[44] Protokollbuch, Minutes of Past. Conf. Wartburg, November 2-4, 1857. The total number of students in the spring had been fourteen. Two received assignments and two were at Detroit. Four had arrived from Germany about the same time as G. Fritschel. During the winter, when Grossmann was in Germany, Schmidt had substituted for him, Chronik, 17. The other data are from a report by G. Fritschel, K. M. 1857, 7, 52, 53, and from another report 5, 36, 37. It appears from the Fritschel report that the personnel was being boarded again, but there was room to house only one student, who was married. The others had rooms with still another student, who had his own house. Two deaconesses, one serving in the kitchen and one teaching the parochial school, were also housed in the seminary. Probably these facts had weight in determining the move.

[45] K. M. 1858, 6 and 7, 41, 42. Grossmann dedicated the structure, Deindoerfer then at Madison, Wisconsin, delivered a sermon.

[46] K. M. 1857, 11, 84.

[47] Document in I. S. D. It is without heading, but a type copy bears the title, Ausgaben fuer den Seminarbau bei St. Sebald. It is simply a listing of expenditures, large payments to contractors, small items for supplies, equipment, etc. (one item reads: for a cool drink for the workers--$.40). The total is $2,156.77. The statement in the text is made on the assumption that this statement is complete. It is probable that considerable additional expenses were incurred for equipment and moving. It has not been possible to discover a statement of the total amount of debts incurred before 1859.

The money had been advanced by P. Kleinlein, then a student at the seminary, or his family, in the expectation that an advantageous sale of the Dubuque property would quickly permit payment of the debt.[48] But 1857 brought a panic and a rapid drop of values as well as tight credit conditions. As a result the seminary property not only had no further rise in value, but it could not be sold at all.[49] For a while there was hope of recovery within a short time, but it soon turned out that failure to take advantage of the favorable opportunity for a sale at boom prices in 1857 had been an irremediable mistake, which once again left the seminary heavily burdened with debt.

Kleinlein subsequently being in need of funds, went to Germany to persuade a brother to emigrate and place his property at family disposal. He failed, but although Loehe and Bauer had thought it impossible to borrow money for the seminary, when the synod had inquired and although Kleinlein was not authorized to act for the synod, he succeeded in raising a loan of 17,500 Gulden for the seminary from a number of individuals. The loan was for two years and since it seemed reasonable to expect that the Dubuque property would become salable within that time, it was accepted under the terms negotiated by Kleinlein and he as well as other creditors were paid off.[50] By this arrangement in 1859 the seminary debt was consolidated in the hands of a group of German creditors and stood at $7,000 with interest at 5 per cent.[51] How it had reached such large proportions is not clear, presumably unpaid interest at high domestic rates and operating deficits had increased the amount.[52]

---

[48] K. B. VI, 7, 51.

[49] The Dubuque property was finally bought in 1866 by St. John's Church for $1,750. St. John's Diamond Jubilee, 13. A not dissimilar situation was to arise in 1873 when the seminary was removed from St. Sebald.

---

[50] There is an annoying lack of contemporary data on the Kleinlein transaction. This paragraph is based chiefly on a copy of a report made by S. Fritschel, entitled, Bericht Sigm. Fritschels, ueber seine Kollektenreise in Russland usw. in I. S. D. The copy bears a notation that it was made from the original by G. J. Fritschel. The report itself was written at Deindoerfer's request when he was writing his Geschichte in the nineties.

[51] Ibid. The amount is confirmed by several documents in I. S. D. which bear no heading and will be referred to as Kleinlein Loan Documents. It appears that a loan of 12,000 Gulden was first contemplated and the amount was increased to 17,500 Gulden by additional subscriptions and transfers. The individual subscriptions do not equal this sum, but it is possible that not all were preserved. On one amount of 2,000 Gulden interest at 4½ per cent was stipulated. The Gulden was worth $.40.

[52] Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Wartburg, March 24-23, 1859. A treasurer's report by S. Fritschel, lists total seminary income, September 25, 1858--March 25, 1859, as $150. It was necessary to borrow $400. High interest rates threatened to ruin the seminary entirely. He notes that Kleinlein has just arrived from Germany with the money and adds, "Soli deo gloria." There is a discrepancy in that the amount of the debt is stated as $6,000. Since treasuries were not kept rigidly separate it may be that other debts were also covered. It seems not unlikely that the Indian mission may have been heavily encumbered at the time. As security the seminary property at St. Sebald and Dubuque and real estate belonging to Kleinlein and Fritschel's father were listed with a valuation of $13,050 and a first mortgage against them was executed in America.

At St. Sebald the name Wartburg became associated with the seminary.[53] Grossmann assumed the pastorate of the congregation and also carried increasingly heavy duties as president of synod, so that he came to withdraw more and more from teaching duties. Since, however, a preparatory course for younger students had become a definite part of the curriculum, the burden was too much for G. Fritschel. S. Fritschel was therefore recalled from a temporary association with the Buffalo Synod and installed at the convention of 1858.[54] The two brothers were to remain associated with the seminary and to form the mainstay of its staff for many years. The course for the younger students extended over six to eight years beginning with languages and other preparatory subjects. Older men were trained for three or four years. They carried a minimum of preparatory work and concentrated on theological studies, taking most of this work together with the advanced students who had completed the work of the lower division, although in some cases they had their own classes.[55] There seem to have been one or more graduates each year in the late fifties.[56] Attendance stood at thirteen and fourteen from 1858 to 1860, in the latter year there were seven each in the two groups.[57]

---

[53] Chronik, 19, indicates that it was adopted at the dedication. However, G. Fritschel in a letter dated July 24, 1857, printed K. M. 1857, 10, 73-11, 86 wrote that the name had been selected (84) at that time, probably by the conference which had decided on the location.

[54] K. B. I, 10 and 11, 4-6. On the Buffalo interlude see infra, ch. VI.

[55] Ibid., III, 8, 60, 61. The younger group studied classical Latin and Greek, the older New Testament Greek and patristic Latin. History and philosophy received much more intensive treatment in the longer course, but were not omitted altogether in the shorter. Courses offered in 1858-59 are listed as: English, German, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and music,

While offerings continued to be raised and while Loehe in 1857 had undertaken to raise $20 a month for support of students who came from Germany,[58] the seminary hoped to provide for a large part of its needs from its farm. In 1857 a manager was made responsible for maintenance and feeding of livestock adequate to meet the needs of the seminary, and for supplying horses when teachers needed them. He was to supervise the farm, do hauling, and also engage in buying and selling under the supervision of the inspector (Grossmann).

---

dialectics, history, mathematics for preparatory subjects. Theological offerings included: biblical history, church history, American denominations, exegesis and practical exegesis, symbolics, church law, Lutheran church constitutions, pastoral theology. Since courses were alternated, this is not the full curriculum.

[56] *Ibid*., I, 1, 8. Several of the men ordained came completely trained from Neuendettelsau, but Endres, listed for 1857, as well as Brandt and Kluge for 1858 had taken some of their training at the seminary. For 1859 see *K*. *B*. II, 12, 96.

[57] *Ibid*., III, 8, 61. Occasionally the figures rose higher. Late in 1857 there were sixteen students, creating problems of space and housing. A kitchen and dining room were added to the structure. In anticipation of a still larger enrollment, conversion of the attic into a dormitory was contemplated, *K*. *M*. 1860, 3, 19.

[58] Letter, Loehe - S. Fritschel, Neuendettelsau, June 5, 1857, in I. S. D. This may have applied to the group then in school.

It was obviously expected that students would do much of the work. Compensation was to be in land if he kept the position for five years. He was to be furnished room, board and personal expenses.[59]

This arrangement was apparently given a trial, but did not work well, for in 1860 a new arrangement was made under which the former manager, Mr. A. Hoeger, rented the farm. Students were now to do hauling and he was to furnish the conveyance. Certain difficulties and claims had to be adjusted, but a mutually satisfactory agreement was reached and Hoeger was to spend the rest of his life in the service of the seminary.[60] The teachers officially became the "directorate of the institution" and supervision over the farm was transferred to them. One of them was to serve as Hausvater in charge apparently of the boarding arrangements, while the directorate managed internal affairs.[61] Troublesome problems of repairs, and construction of barns, and care of livestock kept coming up and led to a new arrangement in 1862 under which a Verwaltungskommission, chosen by synod,[62] the first step toward an eventual board of regents, was to take over supervision and renting of the farm and also building projects and similar problems, but this in consultation with the Hausvater.[63] There was also a Hausmutter. The position seems to have been established in 1856, when Grossmann brought a deaconess from Neuendettelsau for the purpose.[64]

---

[59] Protokollbuch, Minutes of Min. Conf., Wartburg, November 2-4, 1857. It is specifically mentioned that he was to haul firewood cut by students. In most other respects he was to see to things, rather than do them. A prospective manager who had offered his services gratis had withdrawn. If he stayed less than five years, the conference was to decide whether he was to be paid in land or in money. Management of the land owned by Kleinlein and later by Fritschel senior was included, twenty of the forty acres promised were to come from that land.

[60] Protokollbuch. Ausschuss Minutes, those of November 1-2, 1860, made the renting arrangements, those of December 5-6, 1860, dealt with the difficulties. The chief of these concerned a house which Hoeger seems to have built as a residence for himself on seminary property. As renter he was no longer entitled to its use and desired compensation for his labor, or perhaps his investment. The seminary agreed that compensation was due, but presented bills on its part against time consumed and assistance rendered, perhaps by student labor, for which it had to pay. Hoeger agreed to a proposal to set up a mixed arbitration board, to pass on the two sets of claims. The convention of 1860 had decided on the renting arrangement, Chronik, 39. Hoeger eventually was retired on a pension.

---

[61] Chronik, 62. The teachers had already acted as directorate.

[62] Synod of 1860 had named a Verwaltungskommission to manage all synodical property, consisting of three pastors (Klindworth, Dietz, Schueller) and a layman (Duerschner, Galena). Chronik, 39. The reference here is to Wartburg-Abteilung, created by the convention of 1861 as distinct from another in charge of the Dubuque property. (Deindoerfer, Amman, Weege). Ibid., 55.

[63] Protokollbuch. The Ausschuss dealt with repairs on chimneys, cistern, and thresher, and approved a plan for breaking twenty acres according to its minutes of July 2, 1861, and also considered building a barn. The barn also figured in the business of several other sessions, Ausschuss Minutes, May 30-31; July 25, 1861; January 8-9, 1862. In the last-named session the arrangement for the Verwaltungskommission was made.

[64] K. M. 1857, 2 and 3, 24, cf. 7, 49. In 1862 regulations defining the respective duties of Hausvater and Hausmutter were set up. Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, January 8-9, 1862.

The synod of 1860 made the first provisions for student payments. It did so on ground that the income from offerings and gifts did not suffice to maintain the seminary. It was calculated that expenses could be met if every student paid $60 annually. This was to be the basic charge, subject to the provision that whatever came in from the congregations should be distributed equally between the students and the resulting figure deducted from the basic $60. A regular vacation during the harvest season was introduced at the same time, to give students an opportunity to earn money toward meeting the charge.[65] At the same time regular provisions were made for the teachers. They were to have free quarters, to be furnished "the necessary quantities of meat, flour and wood" and to be paid $12 for light as well as a fixed salary of $100 annually, with the qualification that if possible $200 was to be paid.[66]

The convention of 1860 also wrestled with the debt problem. A year had passed since the German loan arrangement had been made and it had only another year to run. The debt stood at $7,000 and there is reason to believe that there were other debts.[67] There was no possibility of selling the Dubuque property at a figure remotely approaching this amount. The interest stood at $350 annually and that sum added to maintenance expenses was producing deficits.[68] Support from Germany continued to arrive, but it is impossible to get a clear picture of amounts received.[69] Feelers seem to have been sent out as to securing an extension of the loan, but reactions were unfavorable, the creditors agreeing only to annual payments of interest, instead of the contracted quar-

---

[65] Chronik, 38. The reporter of this convention to the Kirchen-Blatt deplored the charge on the ground that students should give their entire time to their studies and asked for liberal contributions to the offerings to make this possible, demonstrating with illustrations, how the system was to work, K. B. III, 7, 53, 54.

[66] Chronik, 39. This is the first mention of fixed salaries the writer was able to find.

---

[67] *Chronik*, 39 and *K. B.* III, 7, 54 both give that figure. *Protokollbuch*, Minutes unspecified, January 15, 1860, refer to a debt of $600 to a student (Sussner) under somewhat complicated conditions. *Ausschuss* Minutes, March 19-20, 1861, refer to another debt, amount not given, but possibly dating back to 1854 (when *Hauptrechnung* gave it as $360) to another student or graduate (Kraenzlein) who had gone over to Missouri and payment of which was rather pressing.

[68] *K. B.* III, 9, lists income July 1, 1859--July 1, 1860, as:

From congregations	$229.51
From Neuendettelsau	100.00
Earnings of threshing machine	210.00
Earnings of the farm	282.82
Loans	246.10

[69] *Correspondenzblatt* accounts list considerable expenses for North America, running from $610.87 in 1860 to $1,570.65 in 1857 although decreasing every year. Furthermore each year shows a deficit in the amount listed for the seminary which runs from 50 per cent to 90 per cent of the total. Considerable sums are shown spent for sending out emissaries, which possibly, though not probably, might have come out of the account. It is possible though that debt payments and interest on debts dating back to the purchase of the Dubuque property may have consumed parts of these sums. See 1858, 4; 1859, 1 and 2; 1860, 3 and 4; 1861, 1.

terly remittances.[70] To meet the situation the synod resolved that more seminary publicity should appear in the Kirchen-Blatt and that the pastors of synod were to make efforts to raise special amounts in their congregations during the rest of the year. Furthermore it asked S. Fritschel to go to Europe and raise offerings there for the seminary debt and sent a letter to Loehe, asking for his assistance.[71]

The American efforts did not come to much. Their goal seems to have been modest, to raise enough extra to pay the interest charges for the second year,[72] but they did not succeed. It was projected that Pastor Hoerlein was to go to the East to try to raise money there, but the trip was postponed and there is no evidence that it was ever made.[73]

---

[70] Letter, Max Loehe - G. Fritschel, Fuerth, May 3, 1860, in I. S. D. Max Loehe, brother of the pastor, acted as intermediary and was treasurer of the Gesellschaft and a faithful friend of Iowa. He had tried on his own accord to get the creditors to reduce interest, but they refused. The change in terms was made because of transmission charges.

[71] K. B. III, 7, gives the publicity item and mentions that the pastors were to make their effort before January 15, 1861. Chronik, 39 mentions the letter to Loehe, reports that Fritschel was to collect in America and Europe, and says that pastors were to raise "gewisse Summen" in their congregations and otherwise.

[72] Letter, S. Fritschel - G. Fritschel and Grossmann, Reval, undated, in I. S. D. He wrote that less was raised than in the preceding year. Apparently his correspondents had sent him this information. It is clear that he had expected similar efforts to his own to be made in America and felt rather bitter because everything was heaped on his shoulders.

[73] Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, January 8-9, 1861, report the project. Those of March 19-20, 1861, note postponement to fall, but state that the trip is not to be abandoned. Nothing further is noted.

Grossmann rather half-heartedly projected a journey eastward also, but no results are recorded.[74] Nor do pastors seem to have made any particular effort.[75] Deindoerfer wrote that a collection trip in America was abandoned, because of rising political troubles.[76]

S. Fritschel left in July, traveling steerage on a steamer.[77] He went to Neuendettelsau, but did little soliciting in that vicinity. Instead he obtained references from Loehe and travelled in Hesse, Silesia and in northern Germany. He obtained some results, but felt the effects of prior obligations and of American doctrinal controversy. By fall he was rather discouraged and feared failure.[78] His message in Germany seems to have stressed the moderate position of the synod between Missouri and Buffalo and particularly the missionary character of the work, and the standards adopted by Iowa, and also to have included a description of its organization and its needs, particularly traveling missionaries.[79]

---

[74] Ibid., Ausschuss Minutes, April 20, 1861. He was to go, if he did not feel himself compelled to change his mind. Minutes of May 30-31, 1861, report that he went to Michigan, but again nothing is heard of results and the trip may merely have been made on official business.

[75] See footnote 72.

[76] Chronik, 41. He wrote that Fritschel left directly for Europe and may refer to his failure to collect in America, Fritschel's assignment having mentioned both America and Europe. The troubles must be the electoral campaign of 1860.

[77] Bericht to Deindoerfer, cited in footnote 50. It was only with difficulty that the pastors at the synod were able to raise enough to pay for passage. At arrival he was almost empty handed.

[78] Letter, S. Fritschel - G. Fritschel and Grossmann, Schwieg, October 12, 1860, in I. S. D. Iowa chiliasm raised objections in Silesia. He referred to inevitable humiliations of such an undertaking.

Introductions to Lutheran circles in Russia, the Netherlands and Denmark, and Sweden had also been furnished by Loehe. In the fall Fritschel went to the Baltic provinces of Russia, where he had his greatest success. He spent the winter there, visiting the more important cities, and spending some time in St. Petersburg. Later he also visited Moscow and even the Volga region. Difficulties were not lacking,[80] but he made friends and was able to surmount many of the obstacles.[81] In the summer he was back in Germany and also paid a visit to the Netherlands. The trip to the Scandinavian countries was abandoned, and after another visit to Neuendettelsau he returned to America in October 1861.[82] He had thus spent more than a year in constant and wearing efforts to raise money and to make friends for the seminary as well as for the missionary endeavors of the synod among American Lutherans and also the Indians.[83]

---

[79] Report of an address at Neuendettelsau. Correspondenzblatt, 1860, 12, 45, 46. The audience, pastors and a session of the Gesellschaft were, of course, particularly interested in such matters and it may be that elsewhere he may have given little attention to doctrinal controversy.

[80] He sometimes lacked introductions or, because of doctrinal controversy, Loehe's recommendation was not very helpful. In St. Petersburg he was seriously ill. Foreigners were not permitted to speak in the churches and permission to do so was hard to obtain, yet it was easiest to reach the laity in that way, Bericht to Deindoerfer.

[81] In St. Petersburg he had applied for permission to speak in the churches and had sought the intervention of the consistory, the Ministry of the Interior, and the American Embassy without success. A lady of the court circles at a reception one evening sought and obtained permission directly from the czar, Alexander II. She notified Fritschel at once and he was amused when on succeeding days he received official notices that his request had been granted from the consistory (which had really exerted itself on his behalf), the Ministry of the Interior and the American Embassy, Ibid.

A special session of synod had been called and timed to coincide with Fritschel's return. He and his report were eagerly awaited, but since he returned only in the nick of time he made no written report, giving an address on his experiences and results instead. He had collected a sum sufficient to relieve the seminary from embarassment.[84] Synod expressed its gratitude through a letter acknowledging his achievement and the sacrifices involved and through a gift.[85] No accounting exists in regard to the amount raised, but it seems clear that the debt had been reduced, rather than cancelled.[86] The seminary indeed was to remain in financial difficulties during the war years. Important contacts had been made, however, and for years gifts were to arrive from generous friends in the Baltic provinces of Russia. The circle of German friends too had been widened and in particular contacts established with the Gotteskasten, a missionary organization, in Mecklenburg, an organization which in later years would furnish pastors and students much like Neuendettelsau.[87]

---

[82] *Ibid*.

[83] The undated letter from Reval already cited gives a vivid picture of the strain of unending calls and visits and addresses. He is wearing out from lack of sleep and privacy and misses his family and the stimulation of his work. The *Bericht* to Deindoerfer makes numerous allusions to home and Indian missions, which will receive attention in their proper connections.

[84] *Chronik*, 47, states that synod was called a year ahead of the date set, because it was desirable and in part necessary. *Protokollbuch*, *Ausschuss* Minutes, July 24, 1861, indicate that the time was set provisionally, to agree with the expected arrival. *Synodalbericht 1861*, 37, gives the account of the report.

[85] Undated to Herr Professor, signed by all members present, this letter is in S. Fritschel Papers. The gift was a theological work.

Among various special commissions given to Fritschel had been that of obtaining the services of a Hausmutter in Europe.[88] When he wrote from Russia that Miss Auguste von Schwarz, whom he considered suitable in every respect, would come with him to assume this position[89] there were misgivings whether a woman from the upper strata of Russian society would fit into American frontier conditions. They were completely unjustified, she gave faithful and self-sacrificing service for many years and became a favorite of her generation.[90]

---

[86] In the undated letter from Reval, which was written when Fritschel was about ready to leave Russia, he estimated that he had then raised about half the required amount, but since the interest was not raised in America the total would shrink to less than that. His subsequent activities in Germany and the Netherlands do not seem to have raised very much more than the interest, according to the Bericht to Deindoerfer. In the Reval letter he thought he might have to remain a year or even two longer in order to raise the full amount. The Kleinlein Loan Documents record the repayment of 6,500 Gulden with interest, but are obviously incomplete. If German friends raised additional amounts, or if some of the creditors cancelled or reduced claims, that would explain Fritschel's return earlier than he anticipated, but there is no evidence for either.

[87] Bericht to Deindoerfer.

[88] Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, May 30-31, 1861, record a decision to call a deaconess, Fritschel to make the selection. He must have had earlier instructions, for by that time he had secured Miss von Schwarz.

In the ensuing years the attendance was not large, but fairly steady, usually standing at ten to fifteen.[91] The Civil War did not directly affect the attendance. Though theological students were not exempt from the draft under the terms of the conscription act, it was not frequently applied in Iowa and never in Clayton County. The two divisions were maintained, older men, entering at twenty-five or thereabouts, receiving a minimum of preparatory training, while that of the younger groups was designed to be equivalent to that of a German Gymnasium.[92] The curriculum of any particular semester was usually fixed by or in consultation with the Synodalausschuss or executive committee. Broader questions in regard to the course of study might be discussed at pastoral conferences, particularly at those which met in conjunction with a convention of synod.[93] Examinations before the ministerium proved impracticable as synod grew and a commission was substituted, which in practice might be the Ausschuss, although special cases might still go before a conference.[94] The convention of 1864 provided for a draft of a seminary constitution and an electoral commission which was to take charge of engaging and dismissing teachers.[95] There was no occasion to employ its services for some time to come, although Grossmann, pleading that he was overloaded with work and that the other teachers could handle the load, asked to be relieved of teaching in 1862 until such time as his help would again become necessary. The ministerial conference to which the request was addressed asked him to continue to teach music, to which he agreed.[96]

---

[89] Undated letter from Reval. He reported a substantial donation from her at the same time, which she hoped to make annually. She subsequently made considerable gifts.

[90] She rendered such services as laundering and mending students clothes. K. B. XIV, 20, 205. An entire generation of pastors came to know her as Tante Auguste. She retired in 1875, but after a visit to Russia returned to Mendota, where the seminary then was located.

[91] Lutherische Zeitschrift VII, 10, 156. It gives the current number (1864) as ten and gives the fact that older students usually entered at twenty-five.

---

[92] Protokollbuch. Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862. It was recognized that there must be pastors with scholarly training. Boys after confirmation should spend years in pursuing this goal. But there was also a need for men of practical training. Languages should not, so ran a suggestion, be unconditionally required of them. They might be tested and trained according to results, perhaps if deficiencies were few, private study with their pastors could remove them prior to entrance. Their preparatory training might be confined to three semesters.

[93] Ausschuss Minutes frequently refer to curricular matters, e. g., those of November 1-2, which fixed the curriculum for a semester during the absence of S. Fritschel. Footnote 92 gives an example of a conference considering broader problems. Action of the convention of 1864 is reported K. B. VII, 11, 81, 82.

[94] Protokollbuch. Ausschuss Minutes, July 21-22, give an example of a final examination. Chronik calls this the commission, 59. Ausschuss Minutes, June 1-2, 1862, give a detailed account of a special examination for students whose qualifications were in doubt. Written examinations called for papers on large topics in dogmatics and pastoral theology and for a sermon which was to be delivered before the next pastoral conference. Oral examinations were conducted in four fields, one by each member of the commission which regularly consisted of the teachers and one other member.

There remained debts, both in America and in Germany to burden the seminary.[97] Income rose somewhat, but remained precarious.[98] The Civil War years brought inflation and rising prices. Labor costs on the seminary farm in particular felt their impact.[99] Giving did not keep pace with the increase in the cost of living. At one time the Kirchen-Blatt carried an appeal to bring offerings in farm products and to sell them for the benefit of the seminary.[100] In 1863 the Gesellschaft once again came to the rescue. It promised thereafter to make a regular annual contribution of $600 to the seminary. It would take over the remaining German notes, hold them without charging interest and use $200 of its promised contribution to retire the notes until they were paid.[101] Gifts also continued to come from Russia. The teachers had long occupied quarters of two rooms each on one-half of the first floor of the building. In 1864 a brick residence was built for one of them through the generosity of Baltic friends. Funds for many improvements came from this source. Originally the seminary had been dependent for water chiefly on a spring, located in the woods some distance away, whence it had to be hauled in barrels. Relief came when Baltic contributors made it possible to dig and cement two large cisterns. An endowment fund, the purpose of which was to pay the salaries of the staff, likewise came from there in large measure, beginning in the sixties.[102]

---

[95] Document, Zusammenstellung der Beschluesse der im Jahr 1864 zu St. Sebald versammelten Synode von Iowa, in I. S. D.

[96] Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862.

[97] Letter, F. Fikenscher - Grossmann, Boonesboro, Iowa, January 7, 1862, in I. S. D. refers to a loan which Pastor Fikenscher had made, the amount was $1,200 at 5 per cent interest. It is not explained how it was made, it is possible that Fikenscher who had recently come from Germany had taken over some part of the Kleinlein loan. Not all, however, for an earlier letter, dated December 27, 1861, refers to German creditors of synod.

[98] A financial statement for the year August 1, 1863--July 31, 1864, shows loans of more than $500 lacking about $50 of being balanced by repayments and a deficit of $16.46, Synodalbericht 1864, 44, 45. For 1862 it had been reported that income from American sources ran a third less than in 1860, but a deficit had been avoided because of generous support from European friends. High taxes and inflation and their effect on small, poor congregations were given as the cause, K. M. 1863, 5, 37-9. Ibid., 1864, 1, 4-5 it was noted that American income had increased, but costs were so high that it met no more than half of operating expense.

---

[99] S. Fritschel wrote in the Correspondenzblatt in 1863, that after several replacements they secured a farm hand to take care of livestock who was to receive as much as the two teachers together which, however, was only $15 a month, K. M. 1864, 1, 5. He asked for some volunteer from Germany to take the position for $100 a year. If he were married his wife could work too and a log cabin would be built for them, XIV, 12, 48. He added that despite high wages it was impossible for the renter to secure enough help during harvest, so that part of the crop spoiled.

[100] K. B. VI, 10, 75, 76.

[101] Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, July 21-22, 1863. This aid was paid for many years to come. A letter, M. Loehe --Fuerth, June 12, 13, 1862, in I. S. D. gives the remaining debt as 7,500 Gulden.

In this period attempts seem to have been made to enforce the student payments that had been adopted in 1860. In 1864 it was reported that congregational offerings usually amounted to about $40 per student, and that they usually earned the remaining $20 during harvest, the summer vacation beginning in July. Only occasionally did a student pay in full, though some made up the differences with the aid of relatives. The convention of 1864 reduced the payment to $15.[103] Despite the growing endowment fund the salaries of the teachers fared worse, during 1863-4 the total payment for salaries is listed as $176.23. In 1864, however, the synod resolved to increase the salaries to $300 annually. At the same time the treasurer was to send reminders to congregations and to ask that all offerings which had not been raised in 1863 be made up.[104]

---

[102] The house is mentioned K. B. VII, 11, 84. The water difficulties XIV, 20, 158. A cistern was built in 1862, as was a cellar K. M. 1863, 3, 23. Fritschel's report to Deindoerfer has much information on this subject. He gives the highest praise to Frau Generalin von Helfreich, who raised thousands of rubles, by personal sacrifices such as reductions of food luxuries, sale of jewelry and requests to friends and family that all personal gifts to her be linen or woolen goods, which she could have made up for America. After her death gifts from Russia ceased.

[103] Lutherische Zeitschrift, VII, 20, 156. The reduction is reported in Zusammenstellung 1864. There was occasional comic relief. A proselyte once offered to enter, if he were paid an entrance bonus of $50 and a like sum monthly, K. B. XIV, 23, 205.

By 1864 the seminary may be regarded as well established. It was not yet clear of debt, nor was its income adequate or even secure, but the critical phase was over. It had been a tremendous undertaking for an incipient church body to maintain an institution of higher education from the very beginning especially since its policies of congregational organization militated against a rapid increase in numbers and missions were carried on largely among people still struggling to secure their economic existence. Reliance had been placed mainly upon support from abroad and though that support had fallen short of expectations, it had supplied the capital investment. Neuendettelsau had bought the Dubuque property and turned it over to synod as a gift. When it became clear that the synod could not maintain the seminary and Neuendettelsau could not give adequate help, a new beginning had been made at St. Sebald in order to make self-support through a farm economy possible. More experience in American boom developments might have seen the synod safely through that venture.

---

[104] The financial report is in Synodalbericht, 1864, 45. The resolutions are found in Zusammenstellung, 1864. It is possible that endowment fund payments were in addition to the amount given. However, in the report referred to in footnote 99, S. Fritschel gave the pay of both teachers for a year as equalling $180. The endowment fund for some years to come, aided the seminary chiefly as a source for loan funds. The seminary often was heavily in debt to it. Though the current high rates of interest were charged, failure to meet them, merely increased the capital indebtedness, without danger of foreclosure. It was too small to make possible full payment of even the meager salaries in any case, not reaching its early goal of $10,000 until the end of the century. The resolution of synod in addition to the salary stipulated free flour, potatoes and 700 pounds of meat.

The failure to sell in Dubuque at the right time had produced a new crisis. Baltic contributions and later regular aid from Neuendettelsau solved that problem.

The seminary was maintained in the face of the greatest obstacles because it was felt that it was needed as a source of manpower even though it did not then fill the needs adequately. Organization for its management and operation was slowly developed and had by 1864 attained the forms which were to prevail through the century. In its aims it in part reflected the Nothelfer theory of giving practical training to faithful workers. Clear vision, however, saw the necessity for an educated ministry beyond that expedient. In undertaking a longer course of classical training, the institution was reaching out beyond the functions of the seminary. Difficulties in maintaining two types of students and education under one roof were already making themselves felt[105] and were foreshadowing an eventual separation. Within the seminary a college was already developing.

---

[105] Lutherische Zeitschrift, VII, 20, 156. G. Fritschel in giving a brief description of the seminary and its two types of training maintained that the seriousness of purpose of the older men had a salutary effect on the younger, but admitted that there were difficulties. Presumably the reverse effect was also in evidence.

CHAPTER V

POLICY: PRINCIPLES OF CONGREGATIONAL ORGANIZATION

When the Iowa Synod was organized in 1854 the formation of congregations which it would serve had barely begun. Grossmann at Dubuque and Deindoerfer at St. Sebald were serving groups which represented in the former case the missionary and in the latter the colonial type. It was not possible, for lack of capital to develop the latter type extensively. The immigrants of 1854, after considering settlement in a group, dispersed and no further large scale attempts were made to promote immigration and direct it into compact settlements,[1] except for the project of founding a seminary colony in Kansas, which could not be carried out. The future of the synod clearly depended upon missionary work among unchurched Lutherans.

---

[1] Besides publishing Deindoerfer's account of his visit in Iowa with its inviting description in 1-4, K. M. in 1854 brought a description of the site in Clayton County, 5 Beiblatt, 44-6, which may have been calculated by the editor to attract immigrants who might go on their own resources, even though a passage is printed, in which Deindoerfer asks that the letter be not circulated widely, because he had been accused of an intention to draw settlers away from the Michigan colonies, an aim which he disclaimed strongly. Land for a colony at Dyersville had actually been bought at one time, but the purchase seems to have been cancelled. The immigrants did not like St. Sebald and besides government land sales were suspended in the summer, to enable a projected railway to locate a land grant. S. Fritschel Tagebuch. The same source notes that at least one of the immigrants (Prottengeier) bought land elsewhere and that later the suspension of land sales was revoked. Deindoerfer mentioned in a letter that several of the group later bought land at St. Sebald. He had been ready to move to Dyersville to go along with the plan, but always considered St. Sebald preferable and had not intended to abandon it, but to serve it from Dyersville. The letter also indicates, that despite the disclaimer above of intentions to promote migration from Michigan, he had hoped that settlers would come from there, Deindoerfer - Loehe, November 19, 1854, type copy in I. S. D. Grossmann may have

Opportunities abounded and Deindoerfer already was regretting his inability to reach out farther into Clayton County, while Grossmann was looking up Lutherans to the north of Dubuque, when the new emissaries arrived in 1854. Schueller, whose plans to go to the Indians could not be realized at that time, was assigned to Deindoerfer, while the latter was ill and soon was stationed at Garnavillo, working among the unchurched of Clayton County.[2] Grossmann welcomed S. Fritschel's arrival, because it enabled him to begin work seriously at Sherrill's Mount near Dubuque and S. Fritschel was soon doing missionary work in Illinois and Wisconsin on the other side of the river.[3] When later in 1854 another Neuendettelsau emissary, Doerfler, arrived, he was sent into the region south of Dubuque, at Tete des Morts.[4]

Meanwhile at the organization meeting the synod had considered the principles on which mission congregations were

---

shared these hopes for he mentions that a man who had intended to move to Iowa was excluded from communion in Michigan, letter, Grossmann - Loehe, February 10, 1854, in I. S. D.

[2] Letter, Deindoerfer - Loehe, November 19, 1854, in I. S. D. K. M. 1855, 5, 42.

[3] Ibid., 2, 11; 8, 64.

[4] He arrived in October, Ibid., 2, 15. Fritschel had visited a German settlement there and recommended Doerfler. Ibid., 13.

to be organized. Strongly influenced by Loehe's practices at Neuendettelsau the founders held high ideals. Christian discipline was to be emphasized in order to promote high standards of Christian conduct. Members were to reprove each other for sin in brotherly discipline and thus develop a distinctively Christian community spirit, while official discipline was to be applied to the remiss.[5] A catechumenate, which Deindoerfer had tried at Frankenhilf,[6] was to be a period of probation for applicants for membership in the congregation during which they might be observed, so that their sincerity and their conception of a Christian mode of living might have a chance to reveal themselves.[7] In combination these principles were meant to make for careful selection and close supervision of members, to guard against laxity of standards which would result, if in order to gain numbers rapidly, all comers were cordially invited to join, provided they were in doctrinal harmony, which, of course, was a fundamental requisite. Loehe expressed full approval of this policy, but pointed out it would mean slow growth and material hardship.[8]

---

[5] Official discipline meant the steps of admonition according to Matt. 18, 15-17, leading to excommunication.

[6] A letter, Loehe - Deindoerfer, November 6, 1852, expressed pleasure that the catechumenate was to be tried. Another letter, Deindoerfer - Loehe, December 6, 1852, type copies of both in I. S. D., said that applicants who were known or brought satisfactory testimonials were received at once, and suggested that emigrants be supplied with testimonials. Those not known were placed on probation for six weeks and then either accepted or deferred indefinitely. Deindoerfer did not know that this was the old catechumenate. He adopted the practice in order to prevent an easy influx of people whose sincerity he doubted. Apparently a similar practice had been discussed at Frankenmut, but not adopted, letter, Schmuetzer - Loehe, October 28, 1852, type copy Ibid.

[7] The catechumenate and exercise of both types of discipline were adopted as guiding principles at the organization meeting, Kurzer Bericht, in I. S. D.

A ministerial conference in October 1854 was ready to formulate these principles more specifically. Congregations were to consist of two divisions (Kreise), a narrower group was to form the congregation proper and to have the rights of membership while the peripheral group of catechumens was to be joined with the other in altar fellowship. The catechumenate was to furnish an opportunity to pastor and congregation to determine whether applicants understood the confessions and agreed with them and also to secure agreement, if it were lacking, as well as to furnish an opportunity to learn whether they manifested a sincere endeavor toward sanctification, revealed particularly through acceptance of brotherly admonition. To initiate the catechumenate the pastor was to examine the applicant and announce his application to the congregation that it might keep an eye on him. It was to last half a year, but could be extended if pastor and congregation agreed to do so.[9] The thinking behind this order seems to have been, that it would be better to proceed slowly, beginning with preaching and teaching in schools, gathering a sound nucleus, and then expanding gradually.[10]

---

[8] K. M. 1854, 11, 84-86. He emphasized that pastors would minister to all who wished to hear the Gospel, but that membership was to be restricted to those who had proved themselves. It would be best if pastoral positions could be endowed, to give pastors security independently of numbers, but means were lacking to do this. He described the catechumenate as an experiment designed to deal with evils resulting from American free church principles, success of which was not assured and noted that the synod reserved the right of modification.

The synod also immediately drew up a constitution for congregations which was to express its ideals. Loehe had been consulted and the constitution of Frankenhilf, in which he had had a hand, served as model.[11] This constitution accepted the official position of the synod toward the symbols verbatim, including the Richtung paragraph.[12] A separate paragraph in the same section expressed the firm determination to be and remain German and provided for the exclusive use of the German language. There were provisions for vocation, ordination, and installation of pastors, requiring collaboration of the ministerium and renouncing calls for limited periods and arbitrary dismissals, though providing for ministerial investigations and dismissals after changes and proof, and also for annual visitations. The catechumenate was established with the additional justification that it gave the catechumen opportunity to become acquainted with doctrine, order of service and constitution of the congregation, and his regular attendance at Christenlehre was required.[13] The practice of discipline was likewise established and regulated and excommunicates deprived of all rights, with reinstatement after public confession. Loehe's Agende was adopted and private confession made optional to members, and there were general provisions for sacramental acts and in regard to marriage. Finally the duty to establish a parochial school and having children attend was recognized, the pastor to teach until the congregation could afford a teacher.[14]

---

[9] Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, October 30, 1854. The wording suggests that the catechumenate was definitely established at this time. A somewhat modified version is in Chronik, 7. Deindoerfer read a paper, discussion of which led to the statement.

[10] Loehe set forth these ideas as guiding Iowa practice, before a German pastoral conference. He contrasted it with the practice of quickly gathering large groups which then would have to be sifted as controversy occurred, but added again, that it left pastors in an insecure position and that they should be given support from Germany, Correspondenzblatt 1855, 5, 24; 6, 25.

[11] Chronik, 39. The Frankenhilf constitution is printed in K. M. 1850, 8, 62-4; 9, 67-72.

[12] They are quoted supra, 47.

---

[13] Christenlehre was something of a Sunday School. Sometimes held after the morning service, it was regarded preferable to have it on Sunday afternoon. The entire congregation was invited and expected to attend. The constitution took it for granted that instruction in the catechism would be given.

[14] This constitution was adopted by a ministerial conference held at Dubuque, April 18-19, 1855. It can be found in Chronik, 8-10. There is considerable similarity with the Frankenhilf model in the provisions in regard to calls, etc., and in regard to sacramental and liturgical matter. Some provisions agree verbatim, but there is a good deal in the model which is omitted, notably the church property provisions, and much is adapted rather than copied. The Frankenhilf constitution does not have a similar confessional paragraph.

The convention of 1855 received the first congregational applications for membership.[15] It resolved that a congregation which had adopted syond's congregational constitution might be received, but there should also be a testimonial in regard to its character similar to that which an individual might acquire during the catechumenate. If a congregation had adopted a constitution of its own, it might be received, if it was not in conflict with that of synod, nor lacked any essential part of it. The congregations at Dubuque and St. Sebald were admitted, but that at Garnavillo was informed that its constitution must be brought into harmony, with that of the synod, because it lacked essential provisions.[16] The next year a question arose of affiliated congregations, served by the pastor of a member church. They were asked to sign the constitution of the mother congregation and were to receive the right upon doing so, of

---

From the point of organization the arrangement is: I. Doctrine and language; II. Vocation and dismissal, ordination, installation, visitation; III. Reception into membership; IV. Discipline; V. Order of service and sacraments; VI. Marriage; VII. School. A total of twenty-six paragraphs composes these sections.

[15] St. Sebald and Dubuque were represented by delegates, none is listed for any other congregation. After the synod had established its policy, both congregations applied for membership. Garnavillo also applied, but the minutes do not make it clear when or through whom it was done. Its pastor, Schueller, was present. A delegate may also have been sent, but not listed, because the congregation was not accepted, but he would then probably have been listed as a guest.

[16] The minutes giving this account are printed in K. M. 1856, 6 and 7. This matter is reported, 48, 49. Chronik, 11 also gives the gist of it. The congregation

participating in the election of a parochial delegate. It was also resolved that member congregations must abide by synodical resolutions on pain of losing membership.[17]

Something of the attitude characteristic of these early days may also be gauged from various rules and regulations in regard to ministerial acts, and ecclesiastic practices. Private confession had been strongly stressed by Loehe and was a topic much under discussion. Since the congregational constitution made its use optional, there seem to have been pastors who were quite content with this formal establishment, even though no one used it. The pastoral conference resolved in 1856 that pastors should urge all members to use it occasionally, although failure to do so should not exclude from the altar. Other decisions by the same conference were that Lutheran pastors might solemnize the marriage only of church members. Persons traveling through might be married, if they would promise to join a Lutheran congregation. Church funerals likewise might be given only to church members and catechumens, though here also traveling Lutherans could qualify. In other cases the pastor might deliver a sermon or an address at the grave and it was left to his conscience whether or not he might follow the casket. Mixed marriages caused so much perplexity that

---

was accepted the next year. *Ibid.*, 12. Dubuque and St. Sebald had both accepted synod's constitution as had the congregations at Menominee and Plattsville, Wisconsin. *Ibid.*, 10.

[17] *Protokollbuch*, Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, September 4-5, 1856.

it was resolved to ask for opinions from Loehe and from the Buffalo Synod and the same decision was reached in regard to the baptism, even of children of non-members. Such children might be instructed at their own request and also confirmed and admitted to the altar on their promise to join the church.[18] In regard to reception of pastors, applying for membership, the convention of 1855 had decided that they must not only agree with the position and principles of synod, but bring testimonials similar to those required from congregations in like cases.[19]

The congregational constitution soon proved to be in need of clarification, if not of revision. In 1856 a ministerial conference held that clarification of obscure passages was necessary and asked congregations which had adopted the constitution to make the necessary entries and additions.[20]

---

[18] Ibid. In regard to mixed marriages it was resolved not to reprimand pastors who believed they had a right to perform them, but until the requested opinions were at hand pastors were to discourage them as much as possible. It was also resolved that four weeks was the proper interval between the different grades of disciplinary admonition. Excommunication also was not to be put into effect until four weeks after it had been decided upon. A formula for excommunication was to be drawn up. Nothing has come to light in regard to answers from those whose opinions were sought, but it will be noted below that practices were moderated after a few years.

[19] K. M. 1856, 6 and 7, 48.

[20] Protokollbuch, loc. cit. Changes made it clear that pastors properly convicted were to be excommunicated, incorporated the emphasis on the use of private confession and specified that the congregations recognize the Iowa Synod as their church government, Chronik, 16. In 1857 a draft for a constitution at Dubuque was received from Loehe, in accordance

Succeeding conferences frequently were engaged in revisions until by 1860 a new edition was published. The revised edition omitted a number of points,[21] added new provisions[22] and rewrote a number of paragraphs.[23] The most important changes were in the section on the catechumenate.[24] A new

---

with an earlier request, which is printed, K. M. 1858, 8 and 9, 57-68. It was long and detailed and a pastoral conference in 1858 decided to refer it to the pastors for study with a view toward revision of the synod's own congregational constitution, which in the meantime was to remain in effect. The conference, however, immediately modified a number of points in Loehe's draft which were deemed unsuitable, such as a provision that full membership in a congregation was to be deferred to the age of thirty, Iowa's own age requirement of twenty-one being retained. See Ibid., 69, 70 and Protokollbuch, Minutes Min. Conf., Wartburg, November 2-4, 1858.

[21] Such provisions as one which specified that the pastor was to take communion with the congregations, administering it to himself if necessary, or another which required men who seduced girls to marry them.

[22] A new paragraph authorized the use of such *Agenden*, hymnals, catechisms, and other books only as agreed with the Lutheran confessions. The next paragraph still made the use of Loehe's *Agende* mandatory. The paragraph which named synod as the authorized church government was placed in a new section (VIII). The number of paragraphs was increased to thirty-three, in part by subdivision.

[23] The section on calls, etc., was partly rewritten, no doubt to correspond with practical experience and specified the synod as the collaborating agency. In some instances an orthodox ministerium had previously been indicated. Visitations were to be held every two years, rather than annually. The provisions in regard to private confession gave the choice to the individual, but no one was to be permitted to hold private confession, which was preferable, in contempt.

[24] In addition to the changes noted the old provisions asking the congregation to keep an eye on catechumens and requiring attendance at *Christenlehre* from the latter, were modified so that pastor and vestrymen were to visit them, acquaint them with local principles and usages and admonish them to attend all services regularly, while the catechumens themselves were required to visit the pastor for discussions of a personal nature at his request.

paragraph laid down the general principle that church members must renounce and avoid worldly activities incompatible with baptismal and confirmation vows, such as balls and dances, and secret societies. A distinction was drawn between Lutheran applicants and such as might come from other denominations. The latter were to remain catechumens for six months, although the period might be shortened if it seemed proper. Lutherans who had already proved themselves sincere Christians by attendance and life, or presented proper testimonials, were to receive altar fellowship at once and voting rights after a waiting period which was to enable them to come to agree with the principles and practices of the congregation, however, if such agreement was sufficiently clear from the start, they might be given voting rights at once. Others who brought no reliable testimonials and had not yet proved themselves through their lives, were to be catechumens for at least three months and were not accorded altar fellowship during that time.[25] It seems clear that enforcement of the catechumenate was meeting practical difficulties and that, while the synod wished to retain the institution, it felt a need for greater flexibility.

The section which dealt with excommunication showed only slight changes. Yet this matter too occasioned difficulties and was much discussed at pastoral conferences. Perplexing questions tended to arise and there were also instances of excessive zeal on the part of youthful and inexperienced pastors. Conferences pondered over such questions as: how long should a pastor wait before resorting to discipline in the case of members negligent in the use of the sacrament;[26] should members whose callings prevented attendance at all Sunday services be disciplined;[27] must discipline be applied to members withdrawing from congregations?[28] If these inquiries indicate a tendency toward excessive zeal, there were others, however, which imply basic difficulties: was disagreement with synod's Richtung a valid reason for withdrawal from membership in one of its congregations?[29] What was to be done, if a congregation which accepted discipline in principle, did not agree with its pastor in a particular case?[30] While the rulings on such cases usually followed strict principles, the convention of 1858 warned pastors not to abuse the office of the keys, to proceed slowly and justly and to obtain the consent of the ministerium prior to excommunication. Once it was applied, all pastors of synod were to be notified.[31] By 1860 the ultra strict views in regard to pastoral acts had also undergone some modification. Baptisms were now permitted, even if the parents of the children belonged to no congregation, provided that the parents agreed that they should receive Christian instruction. Pastors were permitted to solemnize the marriages of non-members, if they had shown an interest in the church and were

---

[25] Pamphlet, Gemeindeordnung der evangl. Lutherischen Synode von Iowa.

---

[26] A conference held that if members abstained for periods less than a year pastoral care should apply through personal discussion and encouragement, the general rule being that members should receive the sacrament at least once a year. In cases of longer abstention, however, disciplinary procedure should be applied. Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Wartburg, March 24-28, 1859.

[27] The same conference ruled that if they did not miss the main service on this account, discipline did not apply. If members because of their calling could not observe the entire Sunday that was to be deplored, but it did not constitute desecration of Sunday. It may be observed here that the question of Sunday observance was controversial in the synod. A later conference in the same year heard a paper on the subject which may well have been occasioned by this discussion. It set forth that there had long been two views on the question in the Lutheran Church. One, that of the symbols, held its observance to be nothing more than an ecclesiastical practice; the other held it to be required New Testament observance of the third commandment. The difference was not a church-separating question, Minutes, Min. Conf., September 16-20, Galena. Deindoerfer notes that only a minority of the members held the symbolical view, but that there was agreement that both could be tolerated. However, only one practice should be followed in synod, which would seem to be reflected in the decision above, Chronik, 30.

[28] The Galena conference held that members not under discipline, on withdrawal need not be excommunicated, but the congregation should be informed that they had separated themselves from the body of Christ. Members withdrawing under discipline should as a rule be excommunicated, but in special cases the pastor should get the advice of the ministerium. Something of the temper of the times can be

---

gauged from the fact that when a pastor immediately presented a special case, that of a member under discipline who had withdrawn and joined the Methodist Church, the ruling was that he must be excommunicated, loc. cit.

[29] The Wartburg Conference in 1859 ruled that disagreement with Richtung was not a valid reason for the withdrawal of an individual from a congregation, if he were tolerated, although a congregation might withdraw from a synod for this reason, loc. cit.

[30] The ministerial conference held in connection with the convention of 1858 held that the pastor should try to secure cooperation, but if he failed it was his duty to excommunicate. Ibid., Minutes, Min. Conf., Wartburg, September 13-18, 1858.

[31] Ibid.

not blasphemers. Mixed marriages were still to be opposed, but they were not forbidden absolutely and if the parties could not be persuaded to desist the pastor might marry them with a clear conscience.[32] In regard to burials, however, no changes of policy were authorized.

The first version of the constitution for congregations had been silent on congregational organization.[33] A pastoral conference in 1857 discussed the duties of vestrymen, and concluded that they should exercise two functions. On the one hand they were carefully to administer the property of the congregation and on the other to give faithful care to the poor and the suffering. Besides this they were in their personal conduct to furnish good examples of Christian life and to be diligent in the exercise of brotherly discipline. The pastor at their installation was publicly to admonish them in this respect. There was, however, a good deal of discussion as to whether it would not be better to establish two separate offices, and pastors were permitted if conditions in their congregations warranted it to make a different arrangement. Trustees were to be chosen who were to administer the church property in accordance with the laws of the various states. For charitable services another institution of the old church was to be reestablished, the deaconate. If this were done care should be exercised to choose properly qualified men, who had a compassionate love for the suffering and a gift of consolation. Deacons might also serve as readers in the church if qualified.[34]

---

[32] *Chronik*, 40. These changes were adopted at the pastoral conference held in connection with the Synod of 1860. Questions raised by Pastor Doerfler occasioned them.

[33] Its only mention of congregational offices was that excommunicates could not hold them.

Schisms in early congregations were not infrequent and often gave rise to bitter controversies over church property. To deal with this problem congregations were to enter resolutions into their minutes declaring that the property belonged to the signers of the constitution and that in schisms the synod in which the congregation held membership should have the sole right of determining which of the contending parties might be in the right. If these minutes were then recorded with the public authorities, the synod and not the courts would have jurisdiction.[35]

The revised constitution of 1860 reflects these provisions to but a slight degree. The last point was to have been incorporated in a somewhat different form, in that a number of paragraphs were to be made unalterable and those departing from them were to lose all claims to the property, both ecclesiastic and secular tribunals to be bound by this provision.[36] There are several references to vestrymen, but no section dealing with their selection and duties.[37] A new paragraph imposed the obligation to contribute to the support of the church, pastor and school on all members sharing altar fellowship, though according to their own determination of what Christian love and gratitude demanded.

---

[34] Provision was made for a solemn installation ceremony with laying on of hands for the deacons. Nothing is said about installing trustees, Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Wartburg, November 2-4, 1857.

[35] Ibid. Presumably this procedure was deemed simpler than amending the constitution, which had no amending clause.

---

[36] This provision is recorded as paragraph 34 in Chronik, 37 as a resolution of the convention of 1860. It was not in the constitution as printed. The pastoral conference had in 1859 rewritten the section on the catechumenate as given above, with the exception of the introductory section, opposed to dancing, secret societies, etc. After adoption, a resolution was adopted to have the constitution printed in the new form, Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Galena, September 16-20, 1859. The convention of 1860 made most of the other changes, including the paragraph listed as omitted above and then designated a number of unalterable paragraphs and wrote the additional paragraph 34. Obviously the constitution was printed after this second revision, not only is it dated 1860 but it incorporates the other changes. Omission of paragraph 34 may have been an editorial oversight or a printer's error. The paragraphs designated in it as unalterable defined confessional position of congregation and pastor, declared those addicted to worldly ways, like dancing, etc., ineligible for membership, established the practice of discipline and required that only Lutheran Agenden, hymnals, catechisms could be used in church and school, Chronik, 36, 37. Despite all this there was still no amendment clause. Besides existing in pamphlet form under the title given in footnote 25, this constitution was also printed in Deindoerfer Geschichte, 82-87, and in K. M. 1862, 8, 59-64. Deindoerfer's version had paragraph 34.

[37] The convention of 1860 adopted two paragraphs which did not go into the constitution as synodical regulations. They do not mention the deaconate by name, placing property and charity in charge of the vestry and making it responsible for regular payment of pastoral salary as well as charging it with the duty of a good example. Trustees, however, might be elected separately, but did not have to be and were to represent the congregation over against the state in property matters, Chronik, 36.

For some time to come after 1860 there were only occasional suggestions for further changes in the constitution for congregations. The convention of 1861 considered several proposals, including the dropping of the Richtung paragraph and the weakening of the provision for the exclusive use of German, but declined to take action.[38] A ministerial conference in 1862 discussed a proposal that a simplified constitution should be prepared for provisional use in new congregations to be replaced later by the existing one. Such a constitution would be more readily understood, as it was the formation of congregations was sometimes obstructed. This was also declined on the grounds that constitutions were difficult to simplify, explanations should remove objections, and the subsequent change would be difficult to effect.[39]

---

[38] They were made by a new member from Germany who was something of a crank. He proposed to transfer the Richtung paragraph to the synodical constitution which did not yet exist, on the ground that it was unintelligible to the ordinary member. The conference declined on the ground that it was for the guidance of pastors whose duty it was to explain it. In regard to the use of German, the proposal was to substitute "chiefly" for "exclusively," for the benefit of English pastors and congregations, which also did not exist and must then have appeared visionary. The conference replied that the rule, though not scriptural, was salutary and traditional rules should not be changed without necessity. English congregations would automatically drop it and others could, if they so desired. Another proposal for a consistorial system of the German model was given short shrift. Finally a new provision was suggested, making a religious marriage ceremony as opposed to a civil one a condition of membership. This was also declined, though the conference held that those married by civil authorities should be asked to have the marriage consecrated subsequently and that those who despised the religious ceremony should be disciplined. Synodalbericht 1861, 35-37; Chronik, 53.

In 1862 the Ausschuss issued an instruction to pastors who were being sent out to gather congregations. They were not to proceed according to their own notions, but were to sign a pledge to act according to the tested principles of synod. To begin by organizing the people through acquainting them with the congregational constitution, pressing them to accept it, and gathering signatures, was a totally wrong method. Instead they were to begin with preaching in order to bring people to Christ and into the church, avoiding violent diatribes against other confessions. Nor were they to emphasize liturgical forms, for which the people lacked understanding. Besides preaching they were to baptize children and to open a school for them as soon as possible. Communion and absolution were not to be administered until a congregation was organized, except in cases of death, if their conscience permitted it then. If formation of a congregation appeared feasible, it would be better to delay than to do it too soon. In no case should it be done before four to six months had elapsed and if an exception seemed indicated, report was to be made to the Ausschuss and its opinion awaited. In case of pressure from people who desired the sacrament, the reply must be that they be diligent first in hearing and receiving the Word. When the confidence of the people had been won, they should be led to desire to hear the congregational constitution and it was to be presented not merely by reading it, but by giving a detailed explanation and occasioning a thorough discussion particularly of those points which unchurched people would not understand. They were not to agree to changes in the constitution, at least not without getting an opinion of the ministerium. It contained points demanded by Scriptures which could not be changed and others which could, but in which acceptance was desirable from the point of view of unity. Finally they were to report to the Ausschuss from time to time and to get its advice in case of difficulties, rather than to experiment.[40] This instruction, showing a firm intention to maintain the constitution, but prescribing a standard mode of procedure represents the crystallization of the synod's early policy on congregational organization.

---

[39] Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862. Pastor Schueller made the motion, but after discussion withdrew it. Perhaps the objections which congregations made, rested not so much on failure to understand, as upon objections to the provisions relating to membership. The refusal to consider change may well have reflected an unwillingness to consider real changes. It is true, of course, that the Richtung paragraph must have been unintelligible to many laymen, but there is little evidence that it was often the cause of serious trouble.

---

[40] Document entitled, Instruktion fuer Prediger der Evangel. Luth. Synode von Iowa, welche ausgesendet werden, um unsere Glaubensgenossen zu Gemeinden zu sammeln, in I. S. D. Deindoerfer was instructed to draft it on the ground that experience proved that young brethren often made mistakes in such cases, Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, December 14, 1861. When it was submitted the Ausschuss discussed and accepted it, but suspended the requirement of the written pledge, until approval of the ministerium might be secured, substituting a a declaration of consent to its principles, Ausschuss Minutes, January 8-9, 1862. It was submitted to the ministerial conference of that year at Dubuque which discussed and adopted it without changes. Whether this meant that the written

Excessive disciplinary zeal seems to have been curbed somewhat as a result of a paper presented at the convention of 1861, the principles of which were adopted.[41] It held that purity of the Christian congregation must be secondary to saving souls, fear of contamination must not be the motive behind disciplinary action. Not merely an elite, but a universal church was to be gathered. Excommunication could be justified only by lack of repentance and unwillingness to repent, but not by lack of understanding. Often more could be gained by private admonition than by public discipline and at times it might be wise to overlook sins, like wise parents sometimes overlooked faults in their

---

pledge was to be exacted, is not entirely clear for the minutes state that it was hereafter to be given to all pastors concerned. Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862.

[41] G. Fritschel read the paper entitled, Das richtige Verhaeltnis von Strenge und Milde bei der Uebung der Kirchenzucht. The paper said that small select congregations mean a more peaceful life for the pastor at the cost of a lower income, but that both are extraneous considerations, Synodalbericht 1861; Chronik, 48-51. The account in Chronik admits that mistakes had been made in handling discipline. Theses summarizing the content of the paper were adopted as a declaration of principles.

children, lest defiance be aroused.[42] What was directly forbidden in Scriptures must be handled strictly, on other matters the degree of understanding and human frailty must be considered. Dancing, membership in secret societies could not be tolerated, but must be handled with patience and sympathy. These principles seem thereafter to have been the basis of disciplinary action.[43]

Through its first decade the Iowa Synod was marked by a strong zeal for sanctification, the manifestation in every day life of the Christian virtues and the conscious eschewal and rejection of worldliness. The catechumenate and discipline were maintained for this purpose and the congregational constitution was made a vehicle for the expression of these ideals. Pastoral practice tended to be rigid. By the end of the decade some of the more extreme practices had been modified, but the ideals were still predominant. As Loehe had foreseen the price was paid in smallness of numbers and in internal disturbances in the congregations.

---

[42] They may have had in mind cases, such as the following. A pastor had admonished a man for association with an excommunicated person, apparently over and over again. At length the individual withdrew from membership on the ground that he did not wish to be bothered again and again. The Ausschuss ruled that because association with an excommunicate was not a ground for church discipline and because the individual was extraordinarily weak in Christian consciousness, his withdrawal was not ground for excommunication, but the congregation was to be informed that he had torn himself away from the communion of the church, Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, January 8-9, 1862.

[43] Much less is heard of excommunication cases in the sixties than formerly. Parochial reports show few instances, in most congregations the space provided for them is blank. There is, however, only one parochial report extant for the period to 1861 and that also does not show many excommunications.

CHAPTER VI

COOPERATION: FRIENDSHIP WITH BUFFALO

Expansion of the missionary activities of the Iowa Synod became involved in a rapprochement with the Buffalo Synod in 1855. While intersynodical relations in general must be reserved for fuller analysis, the brief period of friendship and cooperation with Buffalo may be surveyed at this point, because of its effects on the extension of missionary activities beyond the state of Iowa and its immediate neighborhood.

The Buffalo Synod had resolved in 1852 to send pastors Grabau and von Rohr to Germany in order to present there its side of the controversy with Missouri and also to solicit support.[1] In 1853 at the moment when Loehe's adherents were preparing to leave Michigan, the delegates were in Bavaria, discussing their case with Loehe and the group active in the Gesellschaft. An agreement was reached which recognized the doctrine of the ministry as still controversial and expressed the desire that the American churches might join in this view.[2] Loehe received a favorable personal impression of Grabau and von Rohr and found himself in fundamental agreement with their point of view.[3]

---

[1] They were to defend their synod against charges of disciplinary excesses, to charge Missouri with accepting people disciplined by Buffalo without adequate investigation and thus disrupting Buffalo congregations, to seek support for endeavors to establish a seminary for pastors and teachers and to seek to establish unity with the Lutheran Church in Prussia. K. M. 1853, 9, 70, 71. Their visit and its results are discussed Ibid. extending through p. 72 and 10, which is devoted almost entirely to Loehe's comments on the incident. See also Vierter Synodalbrief, 42-4 and 7.

Some individuals from the group of the Loehe emissaries had already found their way into the Buffalo Synod and a few others were to follow,[4] but the Gesellschaft did not enter into formal relations which led to a regular outlet for its students in the Buffalo Synod. The Iowa Synod was to become the intermediary through which Buffalo drew a number of men from a Neuendettelsau background into its service at least for a time. Since Loehe gave public expression to the attitude which has been noted and since this attitude was also reflected in his correspondence with the Iowa group, it came about naturally that contacts between the two synods resulted. As early as July 1854 Grossmann seems to have asked for a copy of Buffalo's constitution, undoubtedly in view of the approaching organization of the Iowa Synod.[5] Grabau could not comply, because Buffalo had none, but gave a number of suggestions.

---

[2] The agreement expressed disapproval of Missouri's acceptance of Buffalo excommunicates without prior consultations with Buffalo's highest instance and the hope that all parties concerned might acknowledge the wrong and avoid it in the future. If Missouri should agree to this, Buffalo was asked to accept the resulting situation, without further attempts to rectify past wrongs. Disapproval was expressed also of the harsh, passionate tone in which the controversy had been waged and both parties were asked to acknowledge this as wrong and to avoid it in the future. In addition, of course, there was the point given in the text. The pastoral conference which drafted this statement refused to go into any particular controversy, because of its manifest inability to hear both sides. The Buffalo delegates signed the agreement, Ibid., 9, 72. Missouri sent a reply defending its own position which was printed Lutheraner VII, 12, 193-4 and reprinted in Geo. J. Fritschel, Quellen und Dokumente, 217-20, footnote.

[3] He was impressed with their frank, but not cringing admission of having done wrong when taken to task, apparently quite severely, for their bitter polemics and again with their personalities in personal contacts, especially by Grabau's breadth of knowledge and personal charm. The agreement in point of view came out in part during personal intercourse, but had in part long since become manifest in Loehe's own writings. He intimated, however, that they differed in regard to the position toward the symbols, K. M. 1853, 10.

[4] Loehe introduced the notice of the arrival of the Buffalo delegates in German with a reference to two Neuendettelsau students now Buffalo pastors, Ibid. 9, 70. They had given him the information on the visit and its purposes and had explained how they had come to be connected with Buffalo, but he does not go into that. In 1858 one member of a group of emissaries, the rest of whom went to Iowa, accepted a Buffalo call, although by that time the friendship had become strained, Chronik 58. It has already been noted that there were negotiations with G. Fritschel about a call to the Martin Luther Seminary, although they came to nothing, supra ch. IV, footnote 34.

Just before the second convention of the Iowa Synod in 1855 Grabau visited Dubuque, apparently under instructions of the Buffalo Synod in order to acquaint himself with its position. It is possible that Grossmann had invited him to come, although the visit was made in connection with official business in Wisconsin and the arrival was unexpected.[6] Grabau came to discuss Missouri charges that Iowa was not faithful to the Lutheran confessions and to determine what its position really was. He found Iowa's attitude acceptable and proposed that the two synods enter into a cordial relationship.[7] The position which Iowa took was elaborated somewhat beyond the brief statement adopted at the time of organization. Symbolical decisions were based on Scriptures and therefore binding beyond dispute. Conversely only definite decisions could claim symbolical authority and therefore there were points where there was room for discussion and doctrinal controversy which might lead to fuller understanding and ultimately to new and perfect decisions.[8]

---

[5] Letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, August 10, 1854, in I. S. D. It refers to an inquiry July 22, 1854, by Grossmann, made to someone else whose name is illegible. Buffalo had not yet felt a need for a constitution. Neither the apostolic church, nor the church at the Council of Nice had had one. Old (German) Kirchenordnungen gave information on institutions, the Scriptures sufficed for guidance. Practical matters were handled by triennial conventions and the ministerium acted between them. Iowa did not adopt a constitution at that time, though perhaps the demonstration that it was possible to exist without one was of greater weight than the historic argument. The practice of taking matters of all kinds before pastoral conferences may well have been influenced by the Buffalo example.

---

[6] J. G. Boehm, a Buffalo pastor, wrote Loehe informing him of the proposed visit which had been discussed by the Buffalo ministerium. He does not say that Grabau had been instructed to make it but if his own sentiments as expressed in the letter were representative the ministerium certainly approved it. He mentioned too that they had heard that Grossmann had expressed the wish for a personal visit. K. M. 1855, 9, 73. Grossmann writes that Grabau arrived altogether unexpectedly, Ibid., 10, 83.

[7] Ibid., 10, 83; 1856, 6 and 7, 50, 51.

[8] Grossmann wrote to Loehe that the position on the symbols was thoroughly discussed on the basis of theses which he submitted and that Grabau was increasingly pleased that Iowa and Buffalo were so fully agreed. He also submitted the congregational constitution, Ibid., 10, 83. Grabau after his return home publicly expressed his approval of the catechumenate also, Ibid., 11, 88. The theses on which the discussion rested do not seem to be extant, but the position of the synod toward the symbols was explained as indicated by Grossmann in a presidential address to the following convention, which met shortly thereafter, Ibid., 1856, 6 and 7, 43, 44. There was to be much controversy on this point which will be considered more fully.

Buffalo had recently acquired a number of congregations in Madison, Wisconsin, and vicinity, when Pastor L. Habel who had gathered them had left Missouri and had been received into membership. Visitation of these congregations was the official business which had induced Grabau to come westward and had furnished the opportunity for his visit at Dubuque.[9] After he had satisfied himself in regard to Iowa's position, he proposed that Iowa furnish men for four parishes in Wisconsin, since Habel was soon to go to Buffalo. Grossmann felt that the synod needed its men, but became interested when Grabau said that it did not matter whether congregations and pastors belonged to Iowa or to Buffalo.[10] Since students Beckel and Weege were soon to graduate from the seminary Grossmann declared himself ready to suggest to the synod that they be placed in Wisconsin. As to the other two charges he suggested Candidate Burk who was soon to come from Germany and Grabau suggested that he ask for another man for the fourth place.[11] Grabau left before the synod convened, having created a cordial personal relationship and initiated a period of cooperation.

Grossmann a few days later reported to the convention of the Iowa Synod the results of the discussion and the agreement that differences, which were not lacking, need not prevent a cordial relationship.[12] The ministerium had advised Beckel and Weege to accept calls to Wisconsin and they had agreed to do so. He referred also to a supreme tribunal which Grabau had been advocating and for which he had requested Iowa's participation. The convention agreed unanimously to do all it could to realize the project.[13] Weege died shortly afterward and was replaced with Pastor Doerfler, whose endeavors to form a congregation at Tete des Morts had not at this time been successful. A conference later in the same year gave its consent to his acceptance of a call to Cottage Grove near Madison and also approved Beckel's acceptance of a call to Lewistown near Portage.[14] Burk did not come until the next year and was then given a different assignment. A call for Madison, however, came to Deindoerfer, who accepted it being replaced at St. Sebald by Pastor F. Dietz, a Neuendettelsau student who had been sent to Fort Wayne, became a Missouri pastor, and now left that synod and entered Iowa.[15]

---

[9] Ibid., 1855, 9, 73.

[10] Ibid., 10, 83.

[11] Ibid., S. Fritschel participated in these decisions.

---

[12] He did not specify what the differences were, but referred to their existence. Ibid., 1856, 6 and 7, 51.

[13] Ibid. The account of the report to synod and its reaction is on 50, 51. The tribunal was a project which Grabau was then advocating earnestly, no doubt, because of the disputes over congregations with Missouri. The project provided that each synod joining in it elect a pastor and a layman as judges, who were to become expert and to serve for life. The tribunal was to have jurisdiction over the participating synods, their ministeria, as well as individual pastors, the congregations and their members, provided that synodical instances had regularly been called into action first. Criteria were to be taken from Scriptures and secondarily from the symbols and from constitutions. If congregations refused to abide by decisions, the aid of public courts might be invoked. If synods proved recalcitrant, the tribunal was to have the power to convoke a general assembly of all member synods to induce compliance and if that failed to resort again to the courts. If false doctrine was found by the tribunal to be the basic issue, a general assembly was to review its decision and in case of recalcitrance to exclude the offender from Lutheran fellowship. The tribunal was to fix its own procedure, individual synods were to meet the expenses of their members. Protokoll, Buffalo Synode, June 24--July 3, 1856, in I. S. D. It is improbable that the plan was presented to the Iowa Synod in such detail in 1855. However, Iowa delegates attended the convention of the Buffalo Synod in 1856 and the convention of that year again agreed to the project and declared itself ready to participate, Chronik, 16. Although participation by three synods was to suffice to get the project under way, the tribunal was never organized.

It should be mentioned here that synod already had a congregation in Wisconsin, at Platteville, which was the most important of various missions which S. Fritschel had founded from Dubuque. When it became clear that two men could not be maintained at the seminary, he had been authorized to accept a call as pastor there.[16] With Platteville the synod thus had five parishes in Wisconsin, Westfield not as yet having a pastor. Some of these newly added congregations had been members of the Buffalo Synod, but there is no difficulty recorded concerning the shift to Iowa either on their part or on that of Buffalo and they soon came to be the field of the Iowa Synod in Wisconsin.

---

[14] Chronik, 12. The conference was held at St. Sebald, November 21-22, 1856. Weege, however, had been intended for Westfield, the fourth charge on Grabau's list, K. M. 1856, 6 and 7, 55.

[15] Ibid., 53. Chronik, 13. Grossmann had suggested Deindoerfer when he visited Madison while in Wisconsin to install Doerfler and Beckel. There was a second congregation, Westport, which Deindoerfer served with Madison and he organized two other charges which he established. Westfield was also served by these men for a time and came into the Iowa sphere. Beckel soon moved there. Madison, Cottage Grove, and Lewistown became members of synod in 1856, Chronik, 14.

Before long Grabau asked for the services of S. Fritschel also. Buffalo had a congregation in Detroit, Michigan, where a change was advisable and Grabau wished to transfer its pastor to the college at Buffalo and to replace him with Fritschel, who was to become a member of Buffalo. Permission to accept the call was given him at the same time that Beckel and Doerfler were designated for Wisconsin, but there was a long delay, before he left Platteville.[17] This may have been due in part to delay in making effective the Buffalo transfer involved, but also in part to Grossmann's wish to retain Fritschel's services for the seminary and also to his interest in an Indian mission then being considered.[18] In addition Iowa seems to have felt that Loehe's consent must be secured[19] and to have suggested that Fritschel be permitted

---

[16] Chronik, 10. A conference at St. Sebald, July 6, 1855, had given the permission, but under the condition that he continue to live and teach at Dubuque. The condition seems to have been dropped after the convention of synod, which placed Grossmann in sole charge of the seminary. It imposed a heavy burden, since Platteville was twenty miles away and he had to travel on foot. However, he assisted at the seminary occasionally afterward, taking Grossmann's place, e. g., while Grossmann spent a week in Wisconsin to install the other men, letter, S. Fritschel - parents, Platteville, March 5, 1856, in Fritschel Family Correspondence.

[17] The membership requirement may not have been understood in Iowa at first. The November conference at St. Sebald, 1855, gave the permission, but attached the condition that he could be recalled whenever synod needed him. A letter, Grabau - Grossmann, October 3, 1855, describes the situation in Detroit, where one of the Missouri schisms had divided the congregation and made it difficult for the pastor, Winkler,

---

to rebuild. A new man should be able to succeed and Fritschel would be well suited and could be replaced for Iowa from Neuendettelsau. Grabau does not mention synodical membership, though the letter seems to imply that it should be with Buffalo. After an intervening letter had suggested that Fritschel go to Madison or Cottage Grove until men were available for these places and Detroit became vacant, a third, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, December 15, 1855, all in I. S. D., objected to a proposal that Fritschel retain membership in Iowa, and the congregation in Buffalo. To avoid such a situation Buffalo, not without misgivings, had turned the Wisconsin congregations over. To meet Iowa's condition Grabau suggested that Fritschel could be vacancy preacher and neither the congregation nor the synod could then hold him if Iowa wished to call him away. He became pastor, however.

[18] There were building activities going on at Buffalo and Winkler was not to assume his position there until they had been completed. A severe winter seems to have delayed them, letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, March 13, 1856, in I. S. D. Grossmann's desire to have Fritschel recalled to the seminary has been discussed in chapter IV. Another letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, March 26, 1856, in I. S. D. refers to Fritschel as considering himself called into Indian missions. There are references to Fritschel's plans in this respect in various letters to him by his brother in the Fritschel Family Correspondence. It will be noted later that he actually joined Missionary Schmidt on an exploratory journey before going to Detroit.

[19] Grabau referred to Loehe's consent as an Iowa condition, in a letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, November 6, 1855, in I. S. D. It is clear that Loehe was consulted and that his reply at first expressed disapproval. Apparently he felt that Fritschel was too young and the Detroit situation too difficult for him. At any rate two letters, Grabau - S. Fritschel, undated, and Winkler - S. Fritschel, Detroit,

to restore amicable relations with the Missouri congregation involved in the Detroit schism.[20] A proposal to merge the seminary at Dubuque with that at Buffalo also was considered,

---

May 29, 1856, both in I. S. D. refute the arguments and tell Fritschel that in their judgment he has all the qualifications needed in Detroit ((Grabau in some detail) and that the situation is not really difficult. Loehe yielded, observing that no really sound judgment was possible from Germany and stating somewhat sharply that in such questions the synod should act for itself. A remark makes it appear that he had not liked going back into reach of the colonies and that Grossmann and Deindoerfer read a veiled disapproval of their removal two years earlier into that, letter, Loehe - Grossmann, Neuendettelsau, March 3, 1856. The issue seems to have contributed to a rift between Neuendettelsau and Iowa, which will be discussed later, for another letter, Loehe-Grossmann, Neuendettelsau, May 24, 1856, denies that it was written in irritation, that neither he nor Bauer can understand what offended Grossmann and that his point was that they could not in Bavaria act as a church government for Iowa. Both Loehe letters are also in I. S. D. Fritschel's pledge of allegiance to Neuendettelsau may have played a part in the Iowa consultation.

[20] Grabau refused to consider this, it could be done only after repentance and apology for past wrongs. Since the group was excommunicated the leaders at least must be shunned and to do otherwise would violate church discipline and the Scriptures as well as the consciences of the Detroit people, letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, April 21, 1856, in I. S. D. Grabau refers to correspondence with Loehe in which the latter offered both G. Fritschel and List to Buffalo. From an earlier letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, February 4, 1856, it appears that Iowa had dropped the request in regard to Detroit. He also said that Buffalo would like to have Loehe visit the Buffalo convention in the coming summer, returning Grabau's visit of 1853 and suggested that Grossmann send the invitation on behalf of both synods. Loehe, however, was seriously ill in 1856 and could not have come.

although no details have come to light and there is no indication that it advanced to a stage where it was near to realization.[21] The delay lasted through the winter. In the spring a call was finally sent[22] and provision was made by Iowa to fill Fritschel's position at Platteville,[23] but then the congregation raised objections.[24] This may have been responsible for further delay, for Fritschel attended the Buffalo convention in early summer and returned to stay through the subsequent convention of Iowa and then travelled to the Indians with an Iowa Indian missionary, before finally severing his connections with the synod, joining Buffalo and taking up his charge at Detroit in September 1856.[25]

---

[21] Ibid. The letter puts it that the suggestion had come from Iowa. It discusses no details, but promises to put it before the synod at its convention that summer and suggests that all the Iowa pastors attend as guests. No further reference to it appears in the correspondence.

[22] Letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, May 24, 1856, in I. S. D. urgently inquires whether he had received the call and would accept it.

[23] Chronik, 12. A ministerial conference, May 28-29, 1856, named Burk as his successor, but also named Fritschel as a delegate to the Buffalo convention.

[24] Two letters, Grabau - S. Fritschel, Buffalo, July 24, 1856, and Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, July 29, 1856, both in I. S. D. hold that since a capable successor was assured it was only human caprice on the part of the congregation that stood in the way and that God had called S. Fritschel to Detroit. These letters were written, however, after the return of the Iowa delegates from the Buffalo convention.

[25] Chronik, 13, 17. Buffalo had hoped that he would stay after its convention. He did not return to Iowa after the trip to the Indians.

It seems clear that there was much hesitation in Iowa over this matter. Grabau's argument that since Buffalo had not hesitated to turn over a number of congregations, Iowa should not hesitate to assign an outstanding man, was not entirely convincing. That the arrangement was finally consummated is evidence that the relationship at the time was close and cordial. The condition, that Fritschel was subject to recall when Iowa needed him, stood as far as Iowa was concerned and does not seem to have been seriously contested by Buffalo.

In the meantime there had been other evidences of close cooperation. The church addition to the seminary in Dubuque presented a grave financial problem. The small congregation at Madison also stood in need of a church and in both instances appeals were made to Buffalo to help. The appeals were somewhat embarrassing, for Buffalo was not a large synod and its own college building program was under way, but Grabau was willing that aid should be given and some came, although the results do not seem to have been appreciable.[26] Another project discussed through these months concerned a new edition of the Buffalo hymnal with some changes and resultant adoption by Iowa.[27] It involved a number of difficulties which delayed its appearance and Iowa never adopted it. On occasion Grossmann also seems to have asked and received advice from Grabau on matters of church practice.[28]

---

[26] Letters, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, March 13, 26 and April 21, 1856, in I. S. D. refer to an offering, apparently at Iowa's suggestion, and are rather critical of the Gesellschaft for not helping congregations. However, the ministerium had agreed to do what it could but there would be delay for there had been a bad winter and the people were poor. Only the last of the letters made a reference to Madison. In a somewhat earlier letter, Grabau-Grossmann, Buffalo, February 13, 1856, in I. S. D. is a promise to submit a request in regard to Dubuque to the ministerium and a suggestion that best results could be obtained in the spring, if Iowans would come to the Buffalo convention and preach there presenting their own cause. Another letter, Grabau -

In 1856 both synods sent delegations to each other's conventions. Grabau had been sending urgent invitations all winter, in connection with the proposed seminary merger, going so far as to invite all Iowa pastors to come as guests. He promised that Buffalo would help pay the travel expenses.[29] In May a ministerial conference in Iowa named Grossmann, S. Fritschel and Deindoerfer delegates to attend and the first

---

Deindoerfer, Buffalo, August 6, 1857, in I. S. D., remits $40 for Madison. There is no record of a remittance to Dubuque, something probably was sent, but it could not have been much, because a large debt remained for years.

[27] Iowa felt a great need for a suitable hymnal and was not strong enough to publish its own. This problem will also receive fuller treatment later. References to the project appear in letters, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, February 4, March 13, May 27, 1856, in I. S. D.

[28] *Ibid*. In the letter of May 27 Grabau gave a detailed description of Buffalo's disciplinary procedure and its derivation from the Pomeranian order in Germany.

[29] The letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, April 21, 1856, cited previously, stated that Grabau was convinced that help could be given toward expenses. It also urged that if not all could come, two or at least one should by all means. Nearly all letters contain invitations. See footnotes 26, 21, 19. That of February 13 expected Grossmann, Fritschel and two others, named by Grossmann, to prepare sermons.

two went the next month.[30] At the synod the chiliast views of some of the emissaries from Neuendettelsau were criticized and S. Fritschel replied that Iowa agreed with eschatological views expressed by Loehe to the Buffalo delegates in 1853. Fritschel felt, however, that some uncertainty remained which he desired cleared up before accepting the call to Detroit. So Grossmann and he discussed the matter more fully with Grabau personally and found that their views differed. All three agreed, however, that the difference need not prevent church fellowship nor impede Fritschel's acceptance of the call.[31]

The Iowa delegates returned home fully satisfied with Buffalo and in September Pastors von Rohr and Mueller attended the convention of the Iowa Synod. It became even clearer at this meeting that there was a difference in the views on chiliasm, but again there was agreement that it need not disturb church fellowship, which Iowa therewith considered fully established.[32] Although this difference in views did not appear until the discussions at the two synods brought it out, it is not impossible that S. Fritschel's delay in going to Detroit until after both had been held, was in part connected with it. At the convention Iowa adopted a number of statements on its teaching in regard to church and ministry and position toward symbols, which the Buffalo delegates accepted.[33]

---

[30] *Chronik*, 12. They were chosen by the western division of the ministerial conference on May 28. The reference in the next footnote indicates that only Grossmann and Fritschel went.

[31] The presentation follows an account given by Grossmann in 1859 in a draft of a letter, dated February 8 to Grabau in the I. S. D. The letter is printed in *Sechster Synodal--Brief von der Synode der aus Preussen eingewanderten evang.-Lutherischen Kirche*, 65-69. It notes in addition that Pastor von Rohr considered the views heretical, but another unnamed pastor agreed with the Iowa viewpoint. This account was written nearly three years later. Grabau maintained that Loehe had changed his position on chiliasm radically between 1853 and 1856, *Ibid*., 4, 7, he implied that the Iowa delegates had concealed their views in 1856 and asserted that he could not remember a private discussion on chiliasm with the Iowans, 5. This was also three years later and since Grabau in 1856 had been anxious to secure the services of S. Fritschel and the chiliast controversy had not then begun the writer is inclined to doubt the accuracy of his memory.

The cordial relationship thus established between the two small synods lasted through 1857. Grabau continued to be in need of pastors and teachers and repeatedly sought to supply his needs from Iowa sources. The most ambitious proposal was made to Grossmann in the spring. Would he accept a position as Grabau's assistant and as inspector of the Martin Luther College at Buffalo? Grabau believed that

---

[32] Chronik, 16, and the draft letter referred to in the preceding footnote. Grabau three years later said that the delegates protested twice against chiliast views presented, but that it became clear that Iowa did not yet have the courage to proclaim these views as doctrine, Sechster Synodalbrief, 5, 6. Two pastors assured the delegates that they would not preach these views, 6. The delegates, however, reported complete harmony to Grabau at the time, noting that Deindoerfer held chiliast views most strongly, but that Grossmann and Fritschel inclined to them too, although not teaching them, p. 54.

[33] Chronik, 16. When these statements were published in 1858, Grabau objected to them, Sechster Synodalbrief, 56.

Deindoerfer could replace him at the seminary and as president of synod.[34] Grossmann refused on the ground that he was needed where he was, but already Grabau had requested the services of F. Doerfler, brother of the pastor and parochial teacher at Dubuque, also serving as treasurer of synod at the time, and after some negotiation got him.[35] In the meantime he induced another teacher, Goehle, who with a number of other men came through Buffalo on the way from Neuendettelsau to Iowa, to remain and take a school there in an emergency.[36] There were other vacancies for which he would have liked to have received men, but in only one other instance was he successful. The pastor of Buffalo's congregation in Toledo accepted the position which Grossmann had declined and Grabau was anxious to fill the vacancy soon, because Missouri had its eyes on the congregation. He requested H. Doerfler from

---

[34] Letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, April 23, 1857. The position offered would have carried a rather heavy burden of work, but hardly as much as Grossmann was carrying. The salary offered $400, probably more than doubled Grossmann's Iowa income. Grabau desired a man who had had experience over against Missouri and asked for other suggestions, if Grossmann could not accept. The refusal is acknowledged in another letter, Grabau - Grossmann, June 15, 1856, both are in I. S. D.

[35] *Ibid.*, the letter of April 23.

[36] Letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, May 8, 1857, in I. S. D. Grabau requested permission to keep Goehle and apparently received it, for on June 15 he writes about settling for his expenses by offerings for the seminary and not charging each other for men or things.

Cottage Grove and was willing to let the congregation join Iowa if necessary, although he thought it too distant to make such an arrangement advisable. Doerfler accepted and like Fritschel amicably withdrew from membership in Iowa and joined Buffalo.[37]

As a result of establishing church fellowship, Iowa permitted applicants for membership in congregations who came from Buffalo churches to join without going through the catechumenate. If, however, such applicants came from congregations formed by schisms from Buffalo churches, they must not only pass through it, but must acknowledge their sin in participating in the schisms to the Buffalo pastor concerned.[38]

---

[37] Letter, Grabau - Deindoerfer, Buffalo, August 6, 1857, in I. S. D. He apparently wrote to Deindoerfer so that the latter might contact Doerfler whose charge was nearby. Chronik, 18, gives the account of Doerfler's change. The congregation at Toledo had been gathered in 1840 and organized in 1842. It remained independent until 1857 and during this period experienced two schisms because it had been organized with a mixed membership. Pastor Hochstetter, who was called to Buffalo in 1857, served it from 1854 to 1857. After he left S. Fritschel preached there and was offered a call, which he refused. He suggested Doerfler, but asked the congregation to join either Buffalo or Iowa. The congregation made an attempt to preserve its independence and called a pastor from the Ohio Synod, but he also refused the call. Then the congregation called Doerfler and joined Buffalo. In Doerfler's first year there was a third schism over adoption of a constitution on Buffalo principles and private communion. K. M. 1859, 10 and 11, 73-82.

[38] Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, September 4-5, 1856. At the same time it decided that applicants from Missouri must pass through the catechumenate until Missouri would establish church fellowship. The statement immediately following is also found in this source.

In 1856 it also consulted the Buffalo delegates about the doctrinal position of other Lutheran synods and church fellowship with them. Since Iowa did not yet have a church paper, an essay by Deindoerfer was sent to Buffalo's Kirchliches Informatorium for publication.[39] Grabau promised to have offerings lifted for the seminary at Dubuque in Buffalo congregations.[40] Buffalo had also promised to cooperate in Iowa's proposed Indian mission and gave it some measure of support until 1859.[41]

Doctrinal discussion between the synods seems to have rested entirely in 1857. S. Fritschel, however, attending a ministerial conference in Buffalo, where his brother, just arrived from Germany, was also present preaching a sermon on the resurrection which aroused no objections, had occasion to defend his eschatological position extensively and unmistakeably. Grabau felt that he evinced a growing tendency toward disputatiousness, but did not feel that it had degenerated into opposition to the truth and the relationship does not seem to have become strained.[42]

---

[39] Ibid., Minutes, Min. Conf., May 28, 1856.

[40] Letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, June 15, 1857, in I. S. D. This offer, however, related to the Goehle expenses previously cited. He estimated that Buffalo owed $80, offerings would raise $100, but he added, over several years. However, he said that they had intended to offer help in any case.

[41] Chronik, 12, 13. The decision was reached at the convention of 1856. Sechster Synodalbrief, 10, says that Buffalo contributed its utmost, but had never received an accounting. No hint is given of amount, if it had been large it would probably have been mentioned in that time of stress.

Although both Fritschel and Doerfler left their synod and served congregations which held membership in the Buffalo synod, Iowa secured an eastern foothold for itself also. Grabau had mentioned when first asking for the services of S. Fritschel that there were missionary opportunities in the Detroit vicinity.[43] Fritschel under an arrangement made when he went east undertook to instruct Iowa students who were sent to him.[44] Through his own efforts and the assistance of these young men, he organized missions at St. Clair and at Newport, the later Marine City. When late in 1857 Bauer was placed in charge of these congregations they wished to stay with Iowa and Bauer remained a member of the synod.[45]

---

[42] The incident is briefly touched upon in Grossmann's letter to Grabau, February 8, 1859, in Sechster Synodalbrief, 67, and by Grabau who used the strong expressions in 1859 on p. 6. He seems to imply that if the ministerium had been on its guard, it might have found G. Fritschel's sermon not entirely unobjectionable.

[43] In the already cited letter, Grabau - Grossmann, October 3, 1855. He mentioned New Baltimore, Mount Clemens and River Rouge.

[44] Chronik, 19. Bauer and Endres were the students who previously had received training at Dubuque. Fritschel thus seems never entirely to have severed his connections with the seminary, assisting at least occasionally while at Platteville and instructing some students privately even while he was a member of Buffalo at Detroit.

[45] Ibid. Deindoerfer states specifically that the congregations did not wish to join Buffalo.

In the next year another candidate, Brand, was assigned to another charge at Swan Creek, also retaining membership in Iowa.[46] These steps aroused a measure of resentment in Buffalo, where the opinion had spread that Iowa was annexing subsidiary congregations affiliated with Buffalo. A pastoral conference at Madison was attended by two Buffalo delegates and it was shown that the congregations in question had never been in affiliation with Buffalo. Iowa agreed that it should not take over Buffalo Filialen but maintained that it was perfectly proper for it to take over uncared for charges, even if they were in the vicinity of Buffalo congregations. The Buffalo delegates dropped their protests, largely based on the belief that Buffalo congregations had been taken and suggested that it would be best if Michigan were to be divided, so that each of the various synods would have its own field. The conference held this to be impossible.[47]

---

[46] Swan Creek had been located by student Sussner as a large group of about 140 families who wished to form a congregation. Brand had been sent there from the seminary with the expectation that he would later return to complete his studies when an expected candidate from Germany could replace him. Brand organized a congregation, although his policies reduced the number to about forty families. They then wished to retain Brand and on Fritschel's advice special arrangements were made for his examinations and he was permitted to take the call, Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., September 13-18 (Synod), 1858. Grabau expected this congregation also to join Buffalo, though it was in no way connected with Detroit. Letter, Grabau - S. Fritschel, Buffalo, August 8, 1857, in I. S. D.

[47] Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Madison, April 10-16, 1858. As noted Buffalo's protest centered around the belief that Buffalo Filialen had been taken by Iowa.

The protests seem to have come from Buffalo pastors in Wisconsin. Grabau's personal position in the matter was moderate, perhaps partly because he had no pastor to serve the charges in question, but also because he did not wish to provoke a break with Iowa. He was willing to go as far as to consider the possibility of ceding Detroit to Iowa, where a group apparently wished to call an Iowa pastor and where Iowa had refused a request to furnish one.[48] Iowa's tactics

---

Filialen were additional organized congregations served by a pastor who lived in the main congregation, members of a parish. The term will hereafter be used in this sense. Iowa's point seems rather fine, since Fritschel had used the services of Iowa students he would have been unable to gather the places without their aid. The Buffalo delegates were stated to have accepted it and to have dropped their protest, while Iowa promised not to annex Buffalo Filialen, and asserted that it had never done so.

[48] Fragment of a letter by S. Fritschel, unaddressed and undated in I. S. D. The minutes just cited refer to two letters by him which were read to the Madison conferences and this fragment may be from one of them. Fritschel emphasized Grabau's fairness, love of peace and consideration and said bluntly that contrasted with it, some of the Iowa tactics appeared immature and inconsiderate, even if the case might be sound in principle, and gave an appearance of justification to the suspicions of the Buffalo men in Wisconsin. This fragment also contains the only references which came to light in regard to the Detroit situation. Apparently there was a group which refused to join the Buffalo congregation and had applied to Iowa for a pastor. Fritschel wrote that he had been informed that Iowa's reason for refusal was consideration for him personally, not for Buffalo. He may have had that in mind in his strictures on Iowa conduct. A letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, February 15, 1855, refers to Newport as isolated from Iowa and difficult for church government to handle. Our Wisconsin brethern want me to reprimand you, but I cannot, because I do not believe you are following a set purpose.

in accepting these congregations do not seem to have been improper, but their wisdom may be questioned. Acquisition of a few isolated congregations in Michigan, so far away from the center of its activities could not be in its real interest, unless followed up by additional missionary endeavor, designed to establish a larger group in that area, which would throw it into competition with Buffalo. It was argued and no doubt correctly that Buffalo was not strong enough to serve the area adequately, but neither was Iowa. No doubt, however, an underlying factor was a growing feeling in Iowa that Buffalo was raiding its manpower and that it was better to conserve it, by beginning missionary activities on its own behalf in the East. Grabau's repeated requests for men perhaps rendered an eventual reaction like this inevitable.[49]

The rift in the friendly relations between the two synods caused by this incident was not serious and would not in itself have led to a break between them.[50] Doctrinal differences, however, were becoming accentuated and were, during 1858, to drive a wedge between the synods. The Iowa men had chiliast views, which they had not concealed, but which they did not stress as long as no controversy on the point was rife. In 1857 the Missouri Synod expelled one of its pastors for chiliast views and Iowa began to present its own views publicly.[51] Immediately, however, difficulty arose over publication in the first issue of Iowa's Kirchenblatt in January 1858 of the statement on its position toward the symbols which had been approved by the Buffalo delegates to the synod of 1856. Grabau felt that the distinction which they made between a dogmatic and a historic acceptance of the symbols, Iowa espousing the latter, opened the door to chiliast views and wrote to S. Fritschel to this effect and asked him and Doerfler not to take sides for Iowa's position, lest the controversy be carried into Buffalo circles.[52]

---

[49] The fragment just cited refers to Iowa emphasis on the fact that Buffalo could not supply Newport and to arguments that it must preserve its manpower. Grabau held the contrary view that it would be more advisable to confine endeavors to narrower limits and work more intensively. He lived up to it when he permitted Iowa to take over the congregations in southwestern Wisconsin. On the other hand, he did not furnish Iowa a single pastor or teacher. Fritschel wrote that he personally would have preferred to have Bauer join Buffalo. Apparently the men at Wartburg did not wish to lose another man, particularly, since Swan Creek might soon have involved another one. The recall of Fritschel was already in process and the Madison conference also asked for that of Doerfler. No doubt the growing differences over chiliasm were also already having an effect.

---

[50] Even when the break became complete in 1859, Grabau referred to the rift as caused by Iowa expansionist proclivities which had the character of childish self-gratification rather than of hostility toward Buffalo, Sechster Synodalbrief, 7. The Madison agreement seems to have adjusted it completely.

[51] The Missouri case concerned Pastor Schieferdecker. It and the entire chiliast controversy will receive more attention later. Iowa's attitude of awaiting controversy is expressed in Sechster Synodalbrief, 68.

[52] The doctrinal statement can most conveniently be found in Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 68, 69, although it is also in K. B., I, 1. It maintained that in the symbols only the theses and antitheses which fixed Lutheran doctrine in regard to historic controversies are really binding. Not every

Fritschel replied that he fully agreed with the position taken by Iowa, accepted the interpretation that left room for chiliastic views, and undertook to justify the interpretation. Since, however, he also did not wish to carry controversy into Buffalo he offered his resignation and asked for a peaceable dismissal.[53]

In the meantime Fritschel's recall had already been considered in Iowa, because Grossmann felt that he should give more of his time to the congregation at St. Sebald and less to the seminary and that Fritschel's personal qualifications were needed. When Fritschel offered his resignation he had already been informed of this intention and had expressed his willingness to return in accordance with the condition connected with his release.[54] In February a conference met and

---

exposition, explanation, etc., in them, which were incidental rather than confessional, need be taken as binding doctrine of faith. The connection with chiliasm is that while certain forms of it were rejected in the Augustana, the Iowans held that other forms were not at that time in controversy and therefore not rejected. The statement did not say this, but Grabau inferred it. His letter to Fritschel is not extant, but the statement above is in an excerpt printed in Sechster Synodalbrief, 56.

[53] Excerpts from Fritschel's letter with interlarded comments, attacking his position, are also printed Ibid., 56, 57.

[54] Letter, Grossmann - Deindoerfer, January 26, 1858, in I. S. D. The Synodalbrief gives the date of Fritschel's reply as February 6, 1858. Grossmann asked Deindoerfer to advance a conference date for the purpose of the recall. He stated that St. Sebald had asked for more of his time and that he ought to move to the parsonage. G. Fritschel had written to his brother and received the reply indicated. There is no mention of doctrinal controversy. Since Grossmann and Deindoerfer were intimate friends it is hardly likely

issued a call which Fritschel accepted, leaving Detroit in August 1858.[55] Though controversy in part underlay this separation, it does not appear to have caused it in the last instance. At any rate it too was accomplished amicably and need not have caused the friendship with Buffalo to end.

Both the doctrinal issues which had thus arisen and the, as yet, unadjusted resentments over the Michigan congregations made it seem advisable in 1858 to both parties to get together for personal discussions. The Dubuque conference

---

that he would have remained silent on the point, had it played a part in arriving at the recall decision.

[55] A letter, Burk - Deindoerfer, Platteville, February 22, 1858, in Deindoerfer Papers reports that the conference met at Dubuque and that Fritschel was recalled, because Buffalo did not like Iowa's chiliasm. Undoubtedly Fritschel had by that time reported his correspondence with Grabau, with the result that the controversy played a part in the actual recall, which it had not played in the original decision to recall. Grossmann in notifying Grabau of the decision mentioned only the need of the seminary as reason and added that the original intention had been to furnish a replacement, but doubted whether as matters now stood Grabau would want one from Iowa, Sechster Synodalbrief, 58. Grabau had been unwilling to accept the resignation and wished to discuss the issue with Fritschel personally. When the call to Wartburg came he asked Fritschel to give the congregation the reason for his resignation. He seems to have felt that Fritschel was avoiding a discussion and that Iowa made it possible for him to do so, and apparently feared that the congregation might blame Buffalo. Letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, May 4, 1856, and Sechster Synodalbrief, 6, 7. From the point of view of not disturbing the congregation Fritschel's course in basing his request for dismissal only on Iowa's need for him was probably much wiser than Grabau's suggested course.

(in February) which sent the call to S. Fritschel instructed Grossmann to invite Grabau to attend the next conference of Iowa pastors to be held in Madison in April. When Grossmann sent the invitation he stated that Grabau had already suggested a personal meeting to him.[56] Grabau was willing but suggested a later date in May.[57] The date could not be changed, however, and Grabau sent Pastors Habel and Mueller to represent Buffalo at the Madison conference.[58] Iowa's Dubuque conference in February had directed that theses on chiliasm be worked out for this discussion.[59] These were submitted, but the Buffalo delegates stated that they were not authorized to discuss them, however, Grabau would do so when a meeting with him could be arranged. They sought instead to hold Iowa to an alleged former promise not to preach or teach chiliasm, but the conference denied that such a promise had been given.[60] In regard to Iowa's published statement on the symbols, one of the delegates who had agreed to it at its adoption in 1856, still saw no reason for objections. It was decided to leave it also open for discussion with Grabau who had objected to it.[61]

---

[56] Grossmann's letter is printed in part at least in Sechster Synodalbrief, 57, 58 and is written in a friendly tone, indicating that a meeting face to face would adjust the difference. A letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, February 15, 1858, in I. S. D. in a similar tone suggests getting together to discuss chiliasm and the symbols.

[57] Letter, Grabau - Grossmann, March 11, 1858, in I. S. D. An accumulation of business made the April date inconvenient.

[58] The conference had originally been scheduled for a later date and had already been moved up, so that a second change seemed inadvisable, Chronik, 20.

[59] Letter, Burk - Deindoerfer, Platteville, February 22, 1858, Deindoerfer Papers. Deindoerfer had not been at Dubuque, but would be host to the conference. Burk apparently was informing him.

This meeting thus did not accomplish much toward attaining doctrinal harmony, although it did settle the territorial controversy. But the way was left open for a personal meeting with Grabau. The latter would have liked to attend the convention of the synod in the fall, but again there was conflict in dates, so that he arrived a week or two before it was to begin. Discussions were held with Grabau and Mueller on the one side, the three Wartburg men, Deindoerfer and a few other pastors and candidates on the other. To a certain extent agreement was obtained on the position toward the symbols. Grabau wrote a few statements on which both parties agreed clarifying the disputed terms, asserting the Biblical truth of all symbolical doctrines and noting that Iowa did not recognize the binding character of mere expositions of doctrine, while Buffalo did.[62] On chiliasm no agreement could be reached,

---

[60] Chronik, 20, 21.

[61] Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Madison, April 10-16, 1858.

[62] The brief theses are printed in Sechster Synodalbrief, 60. The terms were "dogmatic" and "historic" interpretation. Deindoerfer notes that the Buffalo men did not understand Iowa's way of expressing itself, but that there was a real difference over the binding character of expository material.

Grabau considering Apocaypse 20 supplementary while the Iowa men were convinced that it was prophetic. Theses drawn up by the Iowans asserted that their chiliast views lay in a sphere outside of symbolical doctrine, that the doctrines involved were all open questions, although certain ones were by them considered established beyond all doubt, that they rejected the views rejected by the Augustana and that in detail they were striving for a deeper insight, but rejecting all views not in harmony with the symbols.[63] Grabau broke off the discussion, but the Iowans promised a more detailed statement after this convention[64] and Grabau observed that he could tolerate chiliast views as long as they did not lead to extravagant consequences and could recognize the Iowans as brethren.[65] The parting was amicable.

He also writes that Grabau had set the date of his arrival too late to make it possible to call the synod together in time, Chronik, 21-23. A manuscript dated Wartburg, September 5, 1858, in I. S. D. also contains these theses with three Buffalo signatures as well as those on chiliasm. Grabau's disappointment can be seen from his account in the Synodalbrief, 7.

[63] The theses are printed in Sechster Synodalbrief, 59. The doctrines which the Iowans accepted as certain were: Future conversion of the Jews, a personal antichrist, a millenium preceeded by a first resurrection. The rejected views concerned the millenium, which they considered a period to be still characterized by cross and grace. The theses are also in Chronik, 22.

[64] A misunderstanding developed on this point, Grabau expecting correspondence to continue the discussion, Ibid., 7, while the Iowans expected to send him the published report on their synod, which was to contain papers on the disputed subjects, Ibid., 68; Chronik, 23.

[65] Chronik, 23. Grabau mentioned no such statement, but asserted that he believed and on his return told Doerfler

The meeting had not established harmony, but neither did it foreshadow a violent breach, although it made the close cooperation of the past few years unlikely. At the convention which followed, two papers were presented which set forth at length the views which the theses previously published on the position toward the symbols, and the brief theses submitted to Grabau on chiliasm had summarized. The synod declared itself in harmony with the presentations. The papers themselves were published in its first printed synodical report and an account which sketched the chiliast views was printed in the Kirchen-Blatt.[66] The Kirchen-Blatt came into Grabau's hands during October, a copy of the synodical report reached him in January. His reaction to them was to reject the chiliast views as heretical.

The rejection was officially made public when the Buffalo Synod, printed its report of its convention of 1859.[67]

---

that future relations would depend on the expected correspondence and later discussions. Deindoerfer wrote, Ibid., that at parting the Buffalo delegates promised to observe brotherly love, even if they should be impelled publicly to attack Iowa's position.

[66] K. B. I, 10, 11, 1ff; Synodalbericht 1861, 8-31. An analysis must be postponed to a later chapter. It may be noted that the positions taken were highly controversial, particularly in regard to chiliasm and that while the impression was created that this was the official position of synod, the purpose was not to establish a synodical doctrine on which all members must agree, but to present views which its members might hold and in which at that time all concurred.

[67] Sechster Synodalbericht, 21-26 where Iowa's position on the symbols as well as its chiliasm were rejected and 43-54 where the pertinent sections of the Apocalypse were explained.

Practically it was applied between the conventions of the two synods in Toledo where a cause celebre occurred over the action of the congregation there in withdrawing from Buffalo and joining Iowa. The recall of Pastor Doerfler from Toledo had been discussed repeatedly during the meetings of 1858, but Grabau does not seem to have desired it particularly.[68] If he would not propagate chiliasm in the congregation he might stay. Doerfler did not preach on the disputed views, but when the Kirchen-Blatt presented them, he discussed them in the home of an individual member.[69] When correspondence with him revealed Doerfler as an avowed chiliast, who asserted a right to advocate his views, Grabau asked Grossmann to recall him.[70] Difficulties simultaneously developed with Doerfler's brother, now teaching in a Buffalo congregation[71] and in Detroit, where Grabau's son objected to activities by Missionary Schmidt, which induced Grabau to warn Buffalo congregations against Iowa chiliasm.[72]

---

[68] For action of the Madison conference see footnote 49. During the discussions with Grabau at Wartburg, Grossmann observed that Iowa ought to recall Doerfler, when Grabau asserted that Buffalo could not tolerate the preaching of chiliast doctrines in its congregations. Grabau replied that it would not be necessary if Doerfler would not preach chiliasm, only if he would, should he be called away, Sechster Synodalbrief, 7.

[69] Grabau held the view that he did so with the deliberate purpose of building up a faction in their and his favor. When called to account he asserted that he would also preach on the views. Ibid., 8. Deindoerfer wrote that Doerfler had merely read the K. B. report to a small group in a private home and that Buffalo attacks drove him to a firm avowal of his convictions. Chronik, 27. Toledo parties explained that Doerfler had read the Kirchen-Blatt report on the convention of 1858 in the home of a single member on an evening when he and the parochial teacher had been invited there. In addition he had, during an explanation of the 17th article of the Augustana in a weekday service, given a statement on what it rejected and what not and stated his own views. The teacher had reported these events. See K. M. 1859, 10 and 11, 86 and the pamphlet, Wahrheitsgetreue Schilderung, 4.

---

[70] Letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, December 9, 1858, in I. S. D. It is printed in the cited Synodalbrief, 63. It asserted that Doerfler by his action was declaring war on his present synod and was carrying a controversy which had not yet even begun in theoretical discussion into practical affairs. Doerfler denied hostile or insubordinate intent. He had merely intended to reserve his right to act according to his conscience, should circumstances demand open confession, Wahrheitsgetreue Schilderung, 4-5.

[71] A letter, F. Doerfler - Grossmann, Wolcottsville, N. Y., November 12, 1858, in I. S. D. announced that he was unable to agree with his pastor and finding his subordinate position intolerable. His brother in Toledo needed his help and he had given notice to his pastor of his resignation and informed his brother of his availability. Grabau charged later that H. Doerfler in Toledo had instigated this resignation. Sechster Synodalbrief, 64. Grossmann wrote to Winkler that he and the ministerium saw no justification for F. Doerfler's action, disapproved it entirely and had so written him, Ibid., 62, 63. He did, however, subsequently teach at Toledo.

[72] Schmidt was in the East on behalf of the Indian mission and had a fiancee in Detroit. Grabau charged that he was encouraging a chiliast faction in the congregation there and asked that he be called away. He asserted that Schmidt had been denied the pulpit until Buffalo could decide whether it wished to support a chiliast Indian mission, letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, January 15, 1859, in I. S. D., printed Sechster Synodalbrief, 64. Deindoerfer wrote that the congregation had asked that Schmidt preach there and that he, though not eager to accede, had agreed not to mention chiliasm, but that on Grabau's orders he was denied the pulpit as a sectarian and enthusiast. Shortly thereafter a pastoral letter was read on all Buffalo pulpits, warning the congregations against the extravagant (schwaermerischen) chiliasm of the Iowa synodical report, Chronik, 27. The warning may have been due to circulation of the K. B. in Buffalo congregations, Sechster Synodalbrief, 8.

Since Buffalo held Iowa's chiliast views to be heretical it was clearly within its rights in objecting to propagation of them in its congregations and in asking for Doerfler's recall.[73] This view must have prevailed at Wartburg, for a call to a congregation in Illinois was sent to Doerfler in January 1859.[74] There must have been correspondence with him in the meantime, for he sent in his resignation to Grabau before he received the call.[75] Unlike the procedure followed in the case of S. Fritschel, Buffalo gave him a dismissal without asking that he secure the prior consent of the congregation.[76] At a visitation in Toledo which followed shortly thereafter Doerfler and the congregation were told that he was no longer pastor and the congregation was asked to choose a successor. Neither the vestry nor the congregation were willing to assent to Doerfler's dismissal. Instead they inquired whether they could not dissolve the connection with Buffalo, since they did not share its objection to the chiliast views of Doerfler, and join another synod. They were told that such a step was fanatical, if arbitrarily taken. The meetings adjourned without having arrived at action. After a futile meeting of the vestry one of the visitors suggested to Doerfler that the deadlock might be broken through the appointment of a vacancy preacher. Doerfler agreed to this proposal and induced the vestry to accept it. At a second meeting of the congregation it was accepted under protest, the arrangement to last until the convention of the Buffalo Synod in the following summer where the congregation might be shown the errors in the chiliast views. If it still could not agree it might then sever its connection with Buffalo.[77] Doerfler was temporarily to serve

---

[73] Since Doerfler was aware of Buffalo's position, Grabau having visited him on his return from the Wartburg conference, it would seem that he should either have resigned or have preserved meticulous silence. That he did not preach the disputed doctrines during the period of his membership in Buffalo is not disputed. Grabau charged deliberate agitation, but gives no details, Sechster Synodalbrief, 8. It may be that youthful zeal carried Doerfler away in the instance given in footnote 69. It is also possible that the account in the K. B. elicited inquiries which he felt bound to discuss. Grabau clearly believed that he did not wish to leave Toledo and sought to win the congregation over to his view. The charge that he induced his brother to resign in order to come to Toledo, which is not disputed in any extant document, would indicate that he was not then thinking of leaving, although this must have occurred earlier, since his brother's cited letter was dated November 12, and must have been a second letter, since another is mentioned, containing complaints which are not in that one, while Grabau requested the recall on December 9. Since Doerfler did resign at a subsequent stage and even urged his congregation to accept the resignation and since Buffalo then left him there temporarily, it is difficult to believe that he was acting with a deliberate purpose to alienate the congregation from Buffalo, or even that Buffalo thought so at the time. His letters to Grossmann and an account which he gave at the Galena conference are not extant. Since he was recalled, but then given full support both by the Ausschuss and the ministerium, when the congregation left Buffalo, the conclusion that Iowa saw nothing objectionable in what he had done can be avoided only on the assumption that the synod valued the acquisition of the Toledo congregation so highly as to be willing to close its eyes to unethical conduct at the beginning.

[74] Sechster Synodalbrief, 63, 64. An undated letter, Grossmann - Grabau, is given, which was received January 15, 1859, and which stated that Doerfler would receive the call.

---

[75] Ibid., 64. The resignation was dated, January 13, Grossmann's undated letter had stated that he was simultaneously writing to a congregation in Illinois (Jonesboro) and that as a result Doerfler would receive a call from there. Since Grossmann's letter reached Grabau January 15, Doerfler could not yet have had the call on January 13. Grabau seems to have become worried when he heard of the events reported in footnote 69 and to have made inquiries whether Doerfler was carrying on chiliast agitation. Doerfler admitted the facts there stated and included the statement that he would preach his views also. Grabau thereupon charged him with declaring war on his synod, reprimanded him and advised him to resign. Grabau's request became known in Toledo, caused consternation and induced several members to write to Grabau, inquiring for his reasons and giving testimonials of faithfulness on Doerfler's behalf. Grabau's reply requested the vestry to admonish Doerfler. It met with him and was told by Doerfler that he could not be admonished for preaching what he had not yet preached. Doerfler suggested that he might resign but the vestry unanimously rejected the suggestion. See K. M. 1859, 10 and 11, 86-7.

[76] The dismissal was dated January 17, Sechster Synodalbrief, 71. Fritschel's case is discussed in footnote 56. It should be noted that Grabau had previously taken the position that the consent of a congregation must be obtained, before the synod could act, letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, May 4, 1856, in I. S. D. Iowa subsequently stressed this point and also noted that the constitution of the congregation required unanimous consent of the congregation in case of the resignation of its pastor. Letter, Ausschuss - Ministerium, April 1, 1859, printed Sechster Synodalbrief, 72, 73, (copy in I. S. D.) Fritschel's case involved the question of the symbols and Grabau seems then to have feared that the

---

congregation would blame Buffalo for instigating the call to Wartburg which it had not done. In Doerfler's case he charged heresy, which he clearly did not wish to bring before the congregation. According to its constitution he would seem to have been at fault.

[77] It seems clear that the visitors were convinced that Doerfler's chiliast views were heretical and that they were determined to secure his removal for this reason. The fact that the congregation wished to retain him only served to strengthen the conviction that he was misleading it into error. To permit it to leave the synod under these circumstances must to the visitors have seemed tantamount to abandoning it to heresy. If Doerfler could be removed and a sound pastor installed, the congregation might be won over to Buffalo's views on chiliasm. If the congregation sent delegates to Buffalo's convention at a later time, they would hear strong presentations of those views in a setting where they were not likely to be contradicted. Thus if separation from synodical membership could be delayed until after the convention, it could probably be prevented altogether, provided that Doerfler could be removed. The conviction that his views were heretical

as vacancy preacher but was to be relieved as soon as possible. A few weeks later, after the compromise arrangements had already broken down, Pastor Hochstetter, who had been Doerfler's predecessor, was appointed by Grabau to replace him.[78]

---

probably justified in the visitors' minds the insistence upon acceptance of his resignation, despite the obvious unwillingness of the congregation to do so. The device of calling a vacancy preacher rather than a successor secured the acceptance of the resignation, while Doerfler's own temporary appointment as vacancy preacher avoided the necessity of an abrupt break. The presentation of the case in Wahrheitsgetreue Schilderung, 9, 11 indicates that the visitors sought determinedly to delay withdrawal of the congregation from Buffalo, but that their own insistence on Doerfler's removal without asking the consent of the congregation was the primary factor in creating a desire for withdrawal.

[78] This account of the procedure follows a letter, Vorstand...Salemsgemeinde - Herr Pfarrer, Toledo, February 15, 1859, copy in I. S. D., which indicates that much pressure was used and that the congregation agreed only after Doerfler urged it to do so, to avoid the charge of fanaticism. The first congregational meeting was preceded by one of the vestry which testified that Doerfler had not preached heresies and that it would not object to his preaching of the millenium, if presented as opinion rather than doctrine. Substantially similar accounts are in K. M. 1859, 10 and 11, 88 - 12, 92 and in Wahrheitsgetreue Schilderung, 5-11. It may be noted that Doerfler was permitted to conduct Sunday morning services during the visitation and that he followed them with a statement which defended his position, while explaining his resignation. The visitors resented the statement as likely to discredit them. The motivation of the compromise is expressed Sechster Synodalbrief, 77. Doerfler promised not to advocate chiliasm during his vacancy tenure, p. 71. Grabau, von Rohr and one other pastor conducted the visitation according to the cited letter, which also complained of Buffalo's refusal to tolerate the chiliast views and to consider them open questions. Doerfler's appointment was temporary; a call had been extended to another vacancy preacher which the letter revoked. Chronik, 27 asserts that a vacancy preacher was arbitrarily appointed, and in Sechster Synodalbrief, 71, Grabau mentions appointment of Hochstetter on February 22. No doubt the arbitrary appointment of Hochstetter was due to the revocation of the call of the chosen vacancy preacher and the withdrawal of the congregation from Buffalo and represented a desperate endeavor to

In the meantime Doerfler had reported the procedure at the visitation to Wartburg and had received a reply which denied that the chiliast views involved were in conflict with the symbols and that their advocacy as open questions justified dissolution of church fellowship. It expressed indignation over the Buffalo procedure in Toledo, particularly over the denial of the right to break the synodical connection and the pressure under which the compromise had been adopted and concluded with the opinion that if the congregation would withdraw from its membership in Buffalo, Doerfler could not answer for leaving the congregation.[79] The congregation a

---

maintain the compromise. The appointment was intended to be temporary, Hochstetter was to arrange for a call after removing Doerfler, K. M. 1859, 12, 104.

[79] Unaddressed letter, St. Sebald, February 10, 1865, signed by Grossmann and both Fritschels. It is clearly to Doerfler and the document in I. S. D. must be a copy though it is not so marked. It refers to a letter from Doerfler of February 5 which is not extant. The visitation had taken place January 22-27. This letter no doubt induced the Toledo vestry to write the letter of February 15 cited in the preceding footnote which ended in terminating the vacancy preacher's call. The vestry at Toledo had handed the visitors a document as they were leaving in which it informed them of its intention of securing an opinion from the Iowa Synod in regard to the situation. A reply arrived soon afterward which applied the term "mutiny" to this action and asked the congregation to replace the vestry, Wahrheitsgetreue Schilderung, 11. Doerfler had thus probably written to Iowa under instructions from his vestry, although it is not impossible that he may have suggested the action. Iowa's reply no doubt furnished the requested opinion. Chronik, 27, asserts that the visitors had held that the congregation could leave its synod only if the synod were guilty of heresy. Withdrawing for other reasons would be schismatic.

few days later withdrew from Buffalo and applied for membership in Iowa, calling Doerfler as its pastor and notifying the Buffalo vacancy preacher of that action.[80] A small minority did not agree with these steps and addressed complaints to Buffalo. That synod thereafter recognized the minority as the rightful congregation. Pastor Hochstetter served it as vacancy preacher after making an attempt to take over the pastorate and to depose Doerfler.[81] He did not succeed and attempted legal action was dismissed.[82]

---

[80] For cancellation of the vacancy arrangement see footnote 78. Chronik, 27, and Sechster Synodalbrief, 71, document the withdrawal and application. Wahrheitsgetreue Schilderung, 12-13, and K. M. 1859, 12, 94-100, present Toledo's case. A copy of the letter of withdrawal from Buffalo, dated February 20, 1859, is in I. S. D. and the letter is printed K. M. 1859, 12, 95-7. The controversy over chiliasm was given as the reason in the letter, the accompanying exposition indicates that the unilateral dismissal of the pastor also played a part. Withdrawal was preferred to a request for dismissal, because no hope was entertained that the latter would be granted. The letter of application for membership in Iowa, dated February 23, 1859, is in I.S. D. and is printed K. M. 1859, 12, 98-100. It gives agreement that the disputed chiliast points were open questions and objections to Buffalo church government as reasons. On the date of this letter the congregation issued a new call to Doerfler to remove all doubts in regard to regularity which he accepted at once, Ibid., 100-101.

[81] A copy of a document signed by Grabau and Winkler and dated Buffalo, February 23, 1895, which deposed Doerfler and temporarily substituted Hochstetter is in I. S. D. Sechster Synodalbrief, 72, confirms these instructions. Hochstetter saw Doerfler, read the document which deposed the latter, and despite Doerfler's insistence that the congregation no longer belonged to Buffalo, maintained thereafter that he was the legitimate pastor. He entered the church before a Sunday evening service with two dissidents and repeatedly tried to read his document. He was dissuaded amidst considerable disturbance and promised that he might address the gathering after the service. But he entered the pulpit during the prelude for a hymn after the service had begun and insisted on reading his document until someone extinguished the pulpit lights. In the end he was escorted from the church, Ibid., 90.

While these events were occurring in Toledo, the two synodical authorities were corresponding with each other with increasing acerbity. Just before Doerfler's report on the visitation at Toledo reached him, Grossmann had written a long letter, surveying the entire relationship since 1855, in a pacific tone, stressing that there had never been full agreement, but that so far friendly relations had been possible despite differences and inquiring why Buffalo had suddenly

---

For details see Wahrheitsgetreue Schilderung, 13-16, and K. M. 1859, 12, 101-4. Buffalo held that he had done his duty, Sechster Synodalbrief, 92-3.

[82] The complaint alleged that the withdrawal from Buffalo violated the constitution of the congregation in the manner of withdrawal and in departure from unalterable confessional articles. Thirteen complainants faithful to the constitution were alleged to be the rightful congregation who were being denied the use of their property. Some of the complaining group withdrew, so that only nine or seven were left, against eighty-nine defendants. A temporary injunction was denied on the ground that no interference with so large a majority was justifiable, Ibid., 94-96. Only five members had originally voted against withdrawal from Buffalo and only three against the application to Iowa. Buffalo's insistence that this small group of dissidents constituted the legitimate congregation rested upon its contention, that unanimity was required for such actions. The minority requested permission to use the church for their services. This was refused on the ground that they had the privilege of remaining members despite their dissenting views on chiliast doctrines. Thereupon they organized themselves into a congregation and held services in an inn. See Wahrheitsgetreue Schilderung, 15-16; K. M. 1859, 12, 103.

taken a hostile attitude.[83] Grabau replied with a curt request for the recall of Doerfler and Schmidt and complaints about teacher Doerfler. When Toledo withdrew he sent another curt letter inquiring whether Iowa approved, which drew an indignant request to terminate the correspondence.[84] Personal correspondence did cease, but the Buffalo ministerium immediately presented its view of the case to that of Iowa with an inquiry whether Iowa would receive Doerfler's "crowd" into membership.[85] A ministerial conference was called at which Doerfler appeared to give a personal report and to which the relevant documents were submitted. It approved a lengthy reply which held that Doerfler had been wrong in resigning and inducing the congregation to accept his resignation under the pressure exerted, that the congregation had a right to withdraw, and that it was a legitimate congregation; professed willingness to investigate incidental wrongs that might have occurred and secure redress for them; and offered that the dispute be submitted to arbitration, asking Buffalo to make suggestions for the constitution of a tribunal and procedure.[86] The conference also approved a statement which was to be published in the Kirchen-Blatt and resolved to bring charges against the Toledo visitors and the ministerium before the convention of the Buffalo Synod. Doerfler and his congregation were received into synodical membership.[87]

---

[83] Sechster Synodalbrief, 65-69. See also the draft of this letter in the I. S. D. which has been cited repeatedly. The date was February 8. Particular complaint was made of the Buffalo strictures on Schmidt, (see footnote 72). Grabau later stated that the offensive terms had occurred in a quotation and had not been personally applied. Ibid., 92.

[84] Letters, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, February 15, 1859, giving official duties as reason, for not entering into Grossmann's exposition. Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, February 28, 1859, in I. S. D. This letter again complained of Doerfler, whose recall had been promised and of Schmidt now in Toledo. Grossmann - Grabau, St. Sebald, February 24, 1859, copy in I. S. D. Grossmann was surprised that Grabau had the audacity to write again, after slanders such as he had uttered at Toledo. All three letters are printed Sechster Synodalbrief, 69-71.

[85] Buffalo Ministerium to Iowa Ministerium, Buffalo, March 1, 1859. Ibid., 71, 72. (Original in I. S. D.) The word Haufen was used, since Buffalo did not recognize the group as a congregation. A postscript acknowledges Grossmann's last letter to Grabau, reprimanding him for believing everything he heard.

---

[86] Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Wartburg, March 24-28, 1859. Letter, Ausschuss - Buffalo Ministerium, undated. A copy is in I. S. D. and another in Toledo Papers and it is printed in Sechster Synodalbrief, 73-77, which remarks on the long delay and infers from the Ausschuss signatures that no conference had been called. Iowa later stressed the fact that the conference had carefully studied and compared the Buffalo and the Toledo presentations, Wahrheitsgetreue Schilderung, 19, 24.

[87] Minutes cited in footnote 86 and Chronik, 27. A letter to Salem Church, March 29, 1859, in Toledo Papers, an undated copy of which is in I. S. D., notifies the congregation of its reception and of the proposed arbitration and eventual investigation of possible wrongs, also assuring it that it had the right to withdraw from Buffalo. It may be noted that just before the conference Grossmann had received a friendly letter, Habel - Grossmann, Cedarburg, Wisconsin, March 17, 1859, which is in I. S. D., asking that both sides be heard and cautioning against intemperate controversy on chiliasm. Habel, at least, was anxious to maintain friendly relations. The K. B. brought a statement II, 4, 25-27 which reviewed the past relations, noted that Buffalo had at Detroit broken off pulpit fellowship, but asserted that Iowa did not desire controversy and would maintain its former attitude. It would not attempt to proselyte in Buffalo congregations, but would accept congregations which like Toledo wished to join Iowa. It would do nothing to hinder Iowa congregations which wished to join Buffalo.

Buffalo soon replied, denying undue pressure and the Iowa contention that a congregation had a right to leave a synod because of its Richtung, but agreeing to arbitration. It made a full set of recommendations in regard to procedure and phrased the points to be arbitrated in rather offensive terms, including among them the determination of the ownership of the Toledo church property.[88] Iowa's reply accepted the arrangements, named an arbitrator and accepted Buffalo's choice for another, but suggested a rephrasing of the arbitration points and eliminated the one regarding the church property on the ground that the synod had no right to dispose of the property of its congregations.[89] A reply was promptly received which in rather vehement language declared arbitration useless unless the property question were included. If Buffalo should win, its congregation in Toledo would lose. It demanded that Buffalo's points in their former formulation must stand and that Iowa's Toledo congregation as well as Iowa must give a pledge to accept the award in every respect, including property. If Iowa would not agree and insist on its own points, Buffalo would break off negotiations and might resort to the courts.[90]

---

[88] Letter, Grabau - Ausschuss, Buffalo, April 20, 1859, in I. S. D., printed Sechster Synodalbrief, 77-80. The points to be arbitrated were:

"1. Ob Sie ein Recht gehabt, den von unserer Synode unordentlich abgetretenen Haufen in Toledo als Ihre Gemeinde anzunehmen?

"2. Ob Sie unseren Treu--und Wortbruechigen (sic) Vacanz-Prediger Doerfler mit Recht bei diesem Haufen als Prediger anerkannt und bestaetigt haben?

"3. Welchem Theil der beiden Partheien in unserer Salems-Gemeine zu Toledo, dem seiner Synode und Kirchen-Ordnung treu gebliebenen kleinen Theil, oder dem grossen Haufen der Abtruennigen das Kirchen-Eigenthum kirchenrechtlich gebuehre?

"4. Ob der Haufe des Herrn Joh. Doerfler, durch gewaltsames Hinausdraengen unseres Synodal-Bevollmaechtigten und unserer Gemeindeglieder, und Ausweisens des Schullehrers aus der Schule nicht im gewaltsamen ungerechten Besitz der Kirche and Schule sei?"

Grabau also asked that the Buffalo minority be given use of the property to the time of arbitration and wished it understood that acceptance of arbitration did not involve a recognition of Iowa's chiliasm as Lutheran.

Iowa replied that it could not rightfully dispose of the property of a congregation, but that it would have no objection, if the two Toledo congregations would agree to submit the property to arbitration. However, it could not bring pressure to bear. It must object to the entire theory of church government which could induce Buffalo to arrogate such powers to itself. However, it did desire most emphatically to have the real question, whether Iowa as a synod had acted rightly or wrongly in the Toledo question, arbitrated. It urged Buffalo to provide that opportunity and not to create the appearance that it was more interested in the church property than in right or wrong.[91] Buffalo did not reply specifically, but considered the letter together with the earlier correspondence at its convention in July 1859. Simultaneously Iowa submitted formal complaints, which also came before the convention, against Grabau's conduct in Detroit, that of the visitors and Hochstetter in Toledo, and against the insistence on the property arbitration by the eastern division of the ministerium.[92]

---

[89] Letter, undated and unaddressed in I. S. D., printed Sechster Synodalbrief, 80-82. Iowa's formulation read:
"1. Ob eine Gemeinde in gewissen Faellen von einer Synode ausscheiden und mit gutem Recht von einer andern luth. Synode aufgenommen werden kann und
"2. Ob die Gemeinde in Toledo in einem solchen Fall gewesen ist, von der Ehrw. Synode von Buffalo austreten, und die Synode von Iowa, sie in ihren Verband annehemen zu duerfen oder nicht?
"3. Ob der Austritt der Gemeine aus der Synode von Buffalo und die Aufnahme derselben in die Synode von Iowa in regelmaessiger Weise geschehen."

[90] Sechster Synodalbrief, 82-84. This is a letter, Grabau - Ausschuss, dated, Buffalo, June 11, 1859. Date of receipt of the Iowa reply is given as June 4. A letter, Doerfler without address, Toledo, June 16, 1859, in I. S. D. doubted the utility or wisdom of arbitration and questioned the arbitrators. Buffalo would hardly submit, if it lost. Could Iowa, which most likely would lose, submit without sacrificing its principles. Certainly the congregation would not rejoin Buffalo. Property was not mentioned.

---

[91] Sechster Synodalbrief, 84-88. This is a letter, Ausschuss - Ministerium, dated June 30, 1859. Buffalo had specifically requested a reply by July 3, rather sharply without giving the reason, which undoubtedly was that its convention began on July 4. An undated, unaddressed, unsigned copy is in I. S. D. The delay on the preceding reply, which caused the tart request was undoubtedly due to the necessity of convoking the Ausschuss, which met beginning May 27, Chronik, 28.

[92] They are in another undated, unaddressed, unsigned copy in I. S. D. of a letter to the synod printed in Sechster Synodalbrief, 89-91. Though no answer had been sent to the simultaneously received letter on arbitration, a number of footnotes were added to it which for the convention indicated Grabau's comments and exceptions. Ibid., 84-88.

The Buffalo convention heard an account sketching the entire relationship from Grabau, considered the correspondence submitted and found officially that the entire Buffalo procedure had been Christian and just and accused Iowa of faithlessness and misrepresentation. The correspondence was to be broken off, except for a reply to the charges submitted and church fellowship terminated, through a declaration that Buffalo could no longer recognize Iowa as Lutheran. The charges were all rejected, most of them were declared to rest upon chiliast views. A reply justifying the rejection terminated the relationship.[93]

Iowa held no convention in 1859 but a ministerial conference in September received a report on the developments. In the meantime S. Fritschel had been in the East and had conducted a visitation at Toledo and seen at least some Buffalo pastors. His report gave Grabau credit for formal correctness, but found that the facts had been correctly reported and that the actions of synod had been correct. Arbitration had broken down over the property dispute. The conference decided to leave the property question to the congregations and to publish the documents.[94]

---

[93] Grabau's commentary is Ibid., 3-10; the correspondence, 54-91; the synod's verdict, 41; the rejection of the charges, 42; Grabau's reply to them, 91-94. The tone of the latter is sharp.

[94] Chronik, 30-31. Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Galena, September 16-20, 1859. The reference to Grabau's procedure in the Chronik is cryptic. It may mean that Iowa

The eastern pastors of synod, except for Doerfler seem to have entertained doubts in regard to the justifiability of the course of their synod throughout the controversy. In a conference of their own in 1859 they expressed them and subsequently protested at the pastoral conference in Galena.[95]

---

had heard exaggerated reports which could not be substantiated. The essential point would seem to be whether or not he had unconditionally refused the congregation the right to withdraw from Buffalo. The text has made it clear that he did not do this. That he did hold that congregations could withdraw only because of false doctrine in its synod is incontestably clear, *Sechster Synodalbrief*, 78. Iowa felt justified, no doubt, because it could not accept this narrow limitation. *Protokoll; Kirchenvisitation in der Gemeinde des Herrm Pastor Johannes Doerfler zu Toledo durch Herrn Professor Sig. Fritschel den 11 September 59* is in I. S. D., but sheds no light on the point, since the relevant matters are declared to be in a supplement which is not extant. The publications which resulted from the conference resolution have been cited repeatedly. At Toledo the pamphlet *Wahrheitsgetreue Schilderung* was issued which presented the viewpoint of the congregation and gave a summary of actions taken by the Iowa Synod. Another long account, of which a nearly complete manuscript is in Toledo Papers, was published in Germany in *K. M.* 1859, 10, 11 and 12.

[95] Besides Doerfler there were Bauer, Brand, Brueckner, who had begun a new mission at Sanilac, and for a time Rohrlack was stationed in the East as an assistant to Bauer. This group seems to have formed a conference, which expressed its doubts. No conference report is extant. A letter, Doerfler - ---, Toledo, June 16, 1859, in I. S. D., refers to an attempt to make him chairman of the conference which he declined, because he did not think that a separate conference should be formed. It states that Bauer and Brand had doubts of the nature indicated. *Protokollbuch*, *Ausschuss* Minutes, May 26-28, 1859, records that Bauer and Brand were reprimanded for protesting in an unbecoming manner in regard to action taken by the ministerium about the Toledo case and for superficial judgment on basis solely of information from Buffalo's *Informatorium*. A letter, Brand - Grossmann, Swan Creek, July 20, 1859, in I. S. D., asserts loyalty to synod and apologizes if it be thought he had shown disrespect, but expresses surprise that their conference letter was thought a protest, it was meant merely to express doubts. A congregation could change synodical affiliations for *Richtung* reasons, but should not do so precipitately. *Chronik*, 39 notes the protest by Bauer and

In the summer of 1860 Brand renewed objections to certain phases of the Toledo procedure and expressed disagreement with synod's symbolical and eschatological views. He was informed that divergence from the Richtung could be tolerated, but he soon declared his withdrawal on the ground that toleration of divergent views would be unionism. His congregation at Swan Creek also requested dismissal on similar grounds and received it.[96] A little later Bauer withdrew on similar

---

Brand at Galena, but gives no further information, nor do the minutes mention it, though they record Bauer, Brand and Doerfler as present, Brueckner as absent, Minutes Min. Conf., Galena, September 16-20, 1859. Rohrlack was present also, but was stationed in Wisconsin by that time.

[96] Letters, Brand - Grossmann, Swan Creek, June 15, 16 and July 20, 1860. The last is the withdrawal letter and in contrast to the others which sound as if written in turmoil of conscience, has a sharp, sarcastic tone. Chronik, 39 notes the reply of the synod and that Brand was asked to await consultation with S. Fritschel on his way to Europe, but that he did not do so. Another letter, Swan Creek vestry - Grossmann, Schwan Creek (sic), September 20, 1860, requests dismissal with the assertion that Brand was not responsible for the request, but with reasons which must have come from him. All four letters are in I. S. D. Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, November 1-2, 1860, notes that the request was granted, but expresses indignation over the procedure and orders that the wrong done to the synod be placed on the conscience of the congregation. Both pastor and congregation went to Buffalo, Brand later went to Missouri and the congregation returned to Iowa.

grounds and took his Filiale at St. Clair along, but failed to induce Newport to take the same step, the congregation remaining loyal to Iowa.[97] Pastor H. Brueckner, who had arrived from Germany only during the preceding year, still later in 1860 withdrew on similar grounds, but in the following year sought reinstatement and was transferred to Iowa.[98] In the west the congregation at Madison during the 1860 convention submitted a resolution asking that the synod find a way to restore peace between Iowa, Buffalo and Missouri, but contented itself with a promise that an essay on the subject would be published in the Kirchen-Blatt.[99] A belated reaction came when in 1864 Pastor Burk, former secretary of synod, withdrew to join Buffalo renouncing former adherence to chiliast views.[100]

---

[97] Chronik, 43, gives a brief account, charges Bauer with agitation and notes that St. Clair requested and received dismissal in 1861. Letters, Bauer - Grossmann, Newport, August 20, 1860, and undated, charge that the Newport people engaged in dancing, etc., and resisted admonition, and were wrongfully trying to get rid of a faithful pastor. Other letters, Newport vestry - Iowa Synod, August 22, 1860, and undated, indicate that Bauer had maintained that Iowa required him to preach chiliasm and that he held Buffalo views on the authority of the pastor. The congregation asked the synod for Pastor Ide. A letter, Ide - G. Fritschel, Newport, June 20, 1861, reports an investigation at which Bauer reluctantly appeared and cut a sorry figure and from which Ide came to hold the congregation in high regard. All letters in I. S. D. Bauer also went to Buffalo and later to Missouri. Two students, a friend and a relative, also withdrew from the seminary to go to Buffalo.

[98] Chronik, 43. He was influenced by Bauer and Brand. Grossmann came East in 1861 to conduct an investigation at Newport and visited him. He came to the conclusion that the synod had been misrepresented to him, Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, March 19-20, 1861. It may be noted that the Newport investigation had been delayed, because it had been expected that S. Fritschel would return from Europe much earlier and he was to be asked to conduct it on his return to save expenses, Ibid., Minutes, December 5-6, 1860. Brueckner's views at the time of his withdrawal are expressed in a letter, Brueckner - Klindworth, Sanilacville, September 17, 1860, and a fragment of a letter which may have been to Grossmann in I. S. D. They read very much like Brand's and do suggest that he was influenced either by the latter or both by another source. Since these men were isolated and very young, it is not impossible that Buffalo neighbors may have influenced them.

The period of friendly relations between Iowa and Buffalo was but a brief episode. Fundamentally it seems to have been brought about by an insecurity inherent in the status of two small church bodies which faced a common stronger opponent in Missouri. They sought and temporarily achieved cooperation, but neither understood fully the basic views and policies of the other. When these differences became apparent, cooperation became difficult and the relationship strained. They could hardly have remained close friends, but they need not have become hostile, if it had not been for the unfortunate quarrel over Toledo. Neither could have acted otherwise than it did in that controversy without doing violence to its principles. Buffalo held that a congregation could not leave its synod except on grounds of heresy, Iowa was convinced that a congregation could not be held in a human institution such as a synod against its will.

---

[99] Chronik, 40. Madison was one of the congregations gathered by Pastor Habel and taken over at the beginning of the friendship.

[100] Letter, Burk - Ausschuss, Germanville, June 25, 1864, in I. S. D. Burk had written the article in the K. B. in 1858 to which Buffalo objected. He now held that chiliasm was a dangerous heresy and that Iowa held it as synodical doctrine, not as an open question. Burk had been well liked and his withdrawal and the reason for it caused both indignation and sorrow. Letter, Klindworth-Grossmann, Galena, February 12, 1864, in I. S. D. He remained with Buffalo and Grabau through all the later vicissitudes and in later years was occasionally in friendly correspondence with Iowa leaders.

CHAPTER VII

EXPANSION: GROWTH 1854-1864

As a result of the relationship with the Buffalo Synod, the sphere of the Iowa Synod had become enlarged. To its original field in northeastern Iowa with the adjacent areas of Wisconsin and Illinois and its two nuclei at Dubuque and St. Sebald there had been added another in southwestern Wisconsin and still another in Ohio and Michigan, where Madison and Toledo may be regarded as the focal points. As more men became available from the seminary or directly from Germany the synod proceeded to expand its activities in each of these regions. It was destined in time to expand far beyond them. During the first decade, however, only beginnings could be made elsewhere. These as well as the expansion of the existing centers must now be traced.

Missionary opportunities abounded, but men were needed to follow them up. It has been noted that the seminary was beginning to graduate pastors in the late fifties. They were few, however, and the seminary itself was in large part dependent on Neuendettelsau for students. The *Missionsanstalt* there indeed was at this time working almost solely in behalf of Iowa and from it came students to complete their training at the seminary and candidates ready for ordination. The *Anstalt*, however, was small and military laws in Bavaria laid stringent restrictions on emigration, so that in many cases it was necessary to provide substitutes for the men sent, which increased the financial burden.[1] Despite these difficulties Neuendettelsau was an invaluable source of manpower for the small Iowa Synod.

In the fifties, however, a rift threatened for a time to cut this source. It is hardly surprising that misunderstanding should develop, where communication took so long and problems were so pressing. The men in Iowa were sometimes irked over statements made in Germany on basis of which they suffered attack in America.[2] Their financial needs were great and at times they complained when German support was scanty.[3]

---

[1] A letter, Loehe - Grossmann, Neuendettelsau, September 5, 1856, in I. S. D. gives several instances in which military difficulties, impeded or prevented the sending of men. It is merely an example chosen at random, of an ever recurring problem. During the Buffalo relationship several men were apparently offered to Grabau, if Buffalo would provide for the substitutes, letter Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, April 23, 1857. In 1855, Neuendettelsau had eleven students. *K. M.* 1855, 12, 95. It did not have a building of its own for the *Missionsanstalt* until 1866.

[2] A statement by Loehe in regard to parish endowments published in *K. M.* provoked comments which induced a ministerial conference to resolve that the fathers be requested not to publish anything as desired, said or done by members of synod, which was not really theirs and to protest against the view that the Iowa Synod was a mere instrument over against which one might permit oneself almost anything conceivable, *Protokollbuch*, Minutes, Min. Conf., June 6-7, 1855. Missouri's *Lutheraner* was apt to lampoon such statements. The synod as yet had no organ for replying, nor did it wish to enter into barren controversy.

[3] A letter, G. Fritschel - S. Fritschel, Neuendettelsau, March 5, 1855, in Fritschel Family Correspondence, refers to a sharp (*recht groben*) letter by Deindoerfer, written as was understood in Germany, under the stress of dire need.

The fathers in Germany had complaints too. Far more was being asked than they could give; funds sent were diverted to purposes other than intended; reports were infrequent and scanty.[4] When as in the case of S. Fritschel going to Buffalo, advice was asked, received, and not taken, friction developed.[5] In 1856 a sharp letter from Grossmann induced Neuendettelsau to intimate that unless an apology were received, neither men nor money would be sent in the future. Grossmann then traveled to Europe and adjusted the issues in person and the rift was closed,[6] so that thereafter the synod could count on a small but steady trickle of manpower from Neuendettelsau.

---

[4] *Ibid.*, the letter deals with points of friction, but intimates that the difficulties were understood and that on the whole Neuendettelsau was satisfied with the synod and its actions.

[5] See *supra* chapter VI, footnote 19.

[6] A letter, G. Fritschel - S. Fritschel, undated but postmarked Schwabach, September 9, 1856, in Fritschel Family Correspondence (type copy in I. S. D.), deals with this affair. Missionary Schmidt had been given a draft for a considerable sum and told not to let synodical authorities know that he had it, lest the money destined for Indian missions be used for pressing current needs. Behind it lay the remittance of $1,500 for purchase of the seminary, of which $500 had been used to pay debts. Grossmann took offense and expressed himself strongly. The fathers understood Grossmann's irritation, but felt that they owed it to their cause to ask for an apology for his language. Doubtless the incident represented the culmination of a series of petty irritations on both sides. *Chronik*, 17, reports the trip to Europe and notes that it succeeded in its object of adjusting misunderstandings and more firmly establishing the relationship between the synod and the *Gesellschaft*.

In 1854, at the time of the organization four men had composed the synod, Grossmann, Deindoerfer, S. Fritschel and Schueller and before the year was out, Doerfler had joined it from Neuendettelsau. During the next year there were no arrivals from Germany, but the seminary furnished Beckel and Weege, both of whom had had some training in Germany and had first served as teachers, but Weege died, before he could quite complete his studies. In 1856 Dietz came over from Missouri and Burk as well as Missionary Schmidt came from Neuendettelsau. During this year S. Fritschel joined Buffalo. G. Fritschel and List came from Germany in 1857 and the seminary graduated Endres and Bauer, both of whom had previously served as teachers, but Doerfler went to Buffalo. In 1858 S. Fritschel returned, the seminary graduated Brand and Kluge and also Missionary Braeuninger, who was commissioned that year, but not ordained until 1859. In addition, Klindworth, Brueckner and Rohrlack arrived from Germany. Another German arrival, Wollaeger never joined the synod, but took a call from Buffalo.[7] Rapid growth continued during 1859 when the seminary graduated Sack, Wachtel, H. Hempeler and Kleinlein. The last two had received their entire training at Wartburg. Sack, however, died very shortly after his ordination. From

---

[7] Deindoerfer notes the fact without explanation, Chronik, 21. Grabau wrote that Wollaeger attended the discussions at the Wartburg Conference between himself and the Iowa leaders and decided to take the call because he agreed with Grabau on chiliasm, Sechster Synodalbrief, 7.

Neuendettelsau came Koeberle, and Hoerlein. In addition, four men arrived for the Indian mission of whom two, Doederlein and Kessler, were ordained. Doerfler returned from Buffalo and Pastor Schieferdecker, whom Missouri in 1857 had expelled for chiliast views, was received into membership. After five years therefore the ministerium had grown to twenty-seven pastors, theological teachers and ordained missionaries.[8]

In 1860 numbers were reduced through the withdrawal of Bauer, Brand and Brueckner in Michigan, and the murder by hostile Indians of Missionary Braeuninger; but there was no shrinkage in total numbers, because the seminary graduated Ide and G. Hempeler, while Neuendettelsau sent Heckel and Rehwoldt. In addition, Dr. F. Fikenscher arrived from Germany independently and placed himself at the disposal of synod. Another large accession occurred in 1861 when Bredow, Kroencke, Stuermer and Schorr came from Germany, while the seminary graduated Oetjens and Himmler and missionaries Krebs and Flachenecker, who had arrived in 1859, were ordained. In addition Brueckner returned to the synod. There was no net growth in 1862, while G. Reinsch arrived from Germany, Endres resigned.[9] In 1863 the synod received Dunsing, who had studied in St. Louis and the seminary graduated Lutz, Prottengeier, and Vogel; while B. Reinsch came from Germany. Dr. Fikenscher, however, returned to Germany.[10] The seminary in 1864 graduated Kaeding, Ledebur and also Sussner, who left immediately.[11] Over against this stood withdrawals of Burk and Doederlein, while Himmler, Rohrlack and G. Reinsch, professed disagreements which led to their withdrawal also before the year was out or during 1865.[12] Neuendettelsau sent

---

[8] Deindoerfer gives the number as twenty-five, Chronik, 33. He may have omitted Schieferdecker who was admitted in September after the sixth year had really begun, if the time is reckoned from the organization date and Endres who was having trouble in his congregation that year which led to his withdrawal from synod for a time. See Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, July 24, 1861, which note his impending return. The withdrawal itself is not recorded, but after numerous references to him in 1859 there is silence until that notice occurs. It could also be that Deindoerfer was not counting Bauer and Brand, whose disaffection was known, but who did not withdraw until 1860. This is less likely since the Chronik records withdrawal the next year. In addition there were two or three men in the service of the Indian mission, who were not ordained, but who subsequently, after further study, became pastors. It has not seemed worth while to document each accession individually. This listing given follows the Chronik which enters the men under each year as they came or were graduated. This practice will also be followed in the next paragraph in regard to the accessions through 1864.

---

[9] There were no doctrinal differences involved in the case of Endres. He had become involved in difficulties wherever he went, which seem to have been responsible for the earlier withdrawal already noted. After his return he became involved in a scandalous situation, innocently, but through such lack of tact that the Ausschuss doubted his fitness for the ministry and advised his resignation, Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, June 1-2, August 14, December 10, 1862. He subsequently began to gather a congregation at Fort Dodge, Iowa, and asked for reinstatement. The Ausschuss felt that he should prove himself first, which he resented. Ibid., Ausschuss Minutes, April 13; July 21-23; September 16, 1863. Later he was a pastor in the Missouri Synod. Reinsch arrived late in 1861, but did not receive a charge in that year.

[10] Here also there were no doctrinal difficulties. Fikenscher seems to have been a misfit. His suggestions for changes in synod's organization and practice have been discussed in chapter V. Reference has also been made to the loans he made to synod in connection with the seminary debt. He wrote numerous letters to the Ausschuss with criticisms and suggestions in a highly meticulous vein and wrote to Germany in a critical spirit also. The Ausschuss came to the conclusion that he was not of sound mind and advised his resignation, Ibid., Ausschuss Minutes February 4; March 13; April 17, 1863. Chronik notes his return to Germany, 69.

---

[11] Sussner who had originally come as an assistant for the Indian mission, seems to have been a man who compensated for lack of ability with high self-esteem. He had been given numerous chances to prove himself and always failed. In 1864 he was given a last chance as assistant to Rohrlack in Wisconsin with the definite statement that he could never be ordained, but might be an assistant pastor. The Wisconsin conference felt that he had been kept dangling and was ready to ordain him in defiance of the Ausschuss, but changed its mind when it heard him preach. In spite of that Wachtel and Rohrlack ordained him. The case runs through numerous sessions of the Ausschuss as reflected in its minutes from 1860 to 1864. He never appeared as a member of the ministerium, Chronik, 78, notes his withdrawal. Kaeding was made an assistant pastor in 1863, but was not ordained until the following year.

[12] All three gave doctrinal grounds for withdrawal. Members of the synod who knew them, felt that these grounds cloaked personal resentments and desire for material improvement. Himmler offered his resignation on doctrinal grounds, but also noted that he must leave his congregation for lack of adequate support as early as 1863, letter, Himmler-Grossmann, Prairie du Chien, March 16, 1863. He was given another charge and later awarded a measure of support from Germany which had been sent for such purposes. His withdrawal was therefore resented and a notice criticizing it appeared K. B. VIII, 3, 23-4. Himmler published a reply, rather venomous in tone, in Lutheraner XXI, 9, 61. Rohrlack in his withdrawal notice, printed Lutheraner, XXI, 17, 131-35, Ms. in I. S. D., took up cudgels in behalf of Himmler, as well as attacking Iowa's doctrinal position. The motives of both are questioned in a letter, Hoerlein - Grossmann, Cottage Grove, November 7, 1864. Reinsch withdrew in a letter, G. Reinsch - Grossmann, Golcondo, Illinois, December 9, 1865, which gives doctrinal grounds. They are disputed in a letter, Dunsing - Grossmann, Metropolis, Illinois, March 9, 1866, which asserts that he sought a better charge. That is also what Hoerlein believed true of Himmler, Rohrlack according to him, leaving because of dissatisfaction with the way congregational troubles were handled. All three, as well as Doederlein went to Missouri. All letters in I. S. D.

Leupold and Kuechle who arrived after the anniversary date. Neither was to serve long as the former died and the latter withdrew before long. Mention should also be made of Matter and Boden, both of whom graduated from the seminary in 1863, but were not ordained before the anniversary date. Matter was in the service of the Indian mission, Boden became an assistant pastor. Both were subsequently ordained.

In the year in which the synod celebrated its tenth anniversary it had forty-one ordained men in service.[13] A total of forty-nine men had been in its service during the period, two of whom died, not counting Weege, who never served a charge, one resigned, one returned to Germany, three joined Buffalo not counting three others who returned, and one Missouri. Of the total twenty-four had come fully trained from or through Neuendettelsau, three others had come fully trained from other churches, twenty-two had received some part of their training at the seminary, at least six all of it. In addition, an Indian missionary, Matter, had completed his seminary training, but was not yet ordained and another seminary graduate,

---

[13] Deindoerfer, Denkschrift verabfasst zur Gedaechtnisfeier der vor zehn Jahren geschehenen Gruendung der deutschen ev. Luth. Synode von Iowa, 8, gives forty-one as the total number at the beginning of 1864 and refers to later accessions, but not to the withdrawals which occurred at or after the convention to which the Denkschrift was presented. Synodalbericht 1864, 2, gives the total as forty-three which probably included Matter and Boden. Leupold and Kuechle had not yet arrived in August when the convention began. It should be mentioned that during the decade a number of men had applied for membership from American sources. Oswald of Presbyterian antecedents and Friedrichs from the Ohio Synod, seem to have served for a time; neither was, however, admitted to full-fledged membership and they are not counted in the total subsequently given.

Boden, was serving as assistant pastor. There were also three teachers in service in the schools of parishes.[14] Two of the pastors had full time positions at the seminary and three were with the Indian mission, assisted by a deacon, Seyler, who had not yet completed his work at the seminary, as well as by a seminary graduate who had not as yet been ordained.

Much of the earliest missionary work centered at Dubuque, while the seminary was located there. It has been noted that Grossmann gathered St. John's congregation in Dubuque and began work at Sherrill's Mount to the north, that S. Fritschel had visited Tete des Morts to the south and travelled in Wisconsin and Illinois. The latter activity led to the organization in Wisconsin of a congregation at Platteville and another small one, which subsequently disbanded, at Menominee. In Illinois he visited Galena, without much success and gathered a group at Rush Creek, now Elizabeth.[15] Dubuque carried on under Pastor Dietz, after the seminary was removed to St. Sebald. Dietz, besides serving Dubuque, tried to keep in touch with a small mission at

---

[14] F. Doerfler at Toledo, F. Fritschel at St. Sebald and Jaeckel at Maxfield, K. M. 1863, 6, 43. Doerfler went to Buffalo in 1864.

[15] Fritschel tells the story of his travels in detail in K. M. 1855, 1, 2, for Sherrill's Mount and Tete des Morts, in 6, 7, and 8 for Wisconsin and Illinois. He also mentions French Settlement, near Dubuque in Iowa, and Hazel Green, Wisconsin, where he preached regularly for a while, but apparently never organized a congregation. In 1856, 1, 2, 3, he gives more detailed descriptions of the beginnings in Illinois and Wisconsin.

French Settlement, made an unsuccessful attempt at Dunleith, now East Dubuque, and served Tete des Morts, where Doerfler had failed to make a successful start, so well that later it was able to call its own pastor.[16] At Sherrill's Mount, Endres took charge in 1857, but did not stay long, it subsequently declined for a while and was revived under Sussner, serving as assistant pastor under Dietz. Later it was served from Platteville and eventually became strong enough to call its own pastor.[17]

It has been noted that S. Fritschel organized and served a congregation at Platteville as a separate parish. After his removal to Detroit, Pastor Burk served it, but his stern attitude on discipline and objections to dancing, induced the greater part of the congregation to break away and to join the Wisconsin Synod. A remnant remained which continued to be served throughout the period, but was later abandoned.[18] At Rush Creek Pastor List was stationed after his arrival in 1857. He found that two different elements composed the congregation and that strife ensued in particular over liturgical forms. Withdrawals resulted and under his successor, Burk, meager support forced a brief abandonment. In 1861 a new arrangement organized a new parish consisting of two separate congregations. It was supplied with a new pastor and thereafter the parish was able to maintain itself.[19] In Galena successful work began with the arrival of Pastor Klindworth in 1858. S. Fritschel had won no permanent footing there, but Bauer had opened a school there and when List came to Rush Creek, Galena people had invited him and an arrangement had been made under which he and Burk from Platteville each gave some time to Galena. Under Klindworth there was rapid growth at first, then a crisis which sharply reduced numbers and then steady growth, so that the congregation was soon firmly established and had a Filiale or two in the surrounding area.[20]

---

[16] References occur to these places in letters, Dietz - Grossmann, Dubuque, January 13 and October 12, 1858, in I. S. D.

[17] Sherrill's Mount was apparently separated from Dubuque in 1857, for it called G. Fritschel on his arrival from Germany and he was ordained on that call, K. M. 1857, 7, 55; 10, 76-8. Endres was assigned there after the seminary moved, Protokollbuch, Minutes Min. Conf., November 2-4, 1857. Dietz' letter of October 12, cited in footnote 16, refers to occasional services for it. Other letters, Dietz - Grossmann, July 29, 1861, April 1 and May 13, 1862, make it appear that it dwindled away, if it did not die entirely but that chances were good for revival under its own man; that the people liked Sussner and wanted to keep him, even threatened to go to Missouri, if they did not get him. The Ausschuss did not yield, however, though it had a ministerial conference give Sussner an examination, in which he failed, Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes June 1-2, 1862, Minutes Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862. A letter, Vestry, Sherrill's Mount - Ministerium, Cherrills (sic) Mount, October 29, 1862, reports reorganization and affiliation with Platteville. Under Endres, French Settlement was served from Sherrill's Mount. Parochialbericht Sherrill's Mount, March 10, 1858. It and all letters here cited are in I. S. D. See also K. M. 1858, 5 and 6, 43.

---

[18] Letters, Burk - Grossmann, Platteville, February 13, 1859, Burk - ---, Rush Creek, May 24, 1859, describe a worldly attitude and refer to the schism, and describe the faithful attitude of the remnant. Various other letters by later pastors describe the difficulties of existence. All in I. S. D. *Protokollbuch*, *Ausschuss* Minutes, September 29 and November 3, 1862, and July 21-22 and August 31, 1863, also deal with Platteville problems and note the excessive strictness of Burk which had caused the schism.

[19] A letter, List - Grossmann, Rushcreek (sic), October 11, 1858, writes of withdrawals. Letters, Burk - Grossmann, Rush Creek, October 10 and December 19, 1859, discuss his difficulties. A letter, C. A. Graetzinger - Grossmann, Derinda, February 26, 1861, suggests a new pastor and two congregations. A letter, J. Hempeler - Grossmann, Rush Creek, April 29, 1864, makes it clear that difficulties continued even after this arrangement. All in I. S. D. See also *Protokollbuch*, *Ausschuss* Minutes, January 8-9; March 19-20; April 20, 1861.

In the territory to the south of Dubuque in Iowa, Dietz succeeded in organizing a congregation at Tete des Morts, now St. Donatus. He also began work at Bancombe, well to the westward and these two together in 1859 formed a new parish which called Schueller. He lived in Bancombe at first, but that charge soon deserted the Lutheran Church and the pastor moved to Tete des Morts, where there was also some sifting, but where from that time onward a congregation capable of supporting a pastor existed. The pastor carried on missionary effort in adjacent territory and established preaching places at Andrew, Bellevue and Van Buren, which for a time had Stuermer as its own pastor. In 1864 Andrew became independent, and Schueller moved there, Tete des Morts calling Dietz from

---

[20] Protokollbuch, Minutes Min. Conf., September 13-18, 1858. Chronik, 11, letters, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, August 14 and August 29, 1860; July 13, 1864. The last notes that some of the dissidents had returned and that interrupted plans for building a church were now in process of fulfillment. There is also a petition for Klindworth's assignment to Galena in the I. S. D. as are the letters. The people agreed to accept the congregational constitution of the synod, objection to which caused some of the later trouble. Galena Parochialbericht 1860 lists forty-five families, 110 communicants, that for 1861 only eighteen families, sixty-three

Dubuque.[21] When a Presbyterian pastor, Oswald, in 1861 opened negotiations with the synod for the purpose of becoming a Lutheran and a member of the synod, a foothold was gained in the field which he served in the vicinity of Monticello to the southwestward. In 1862 G. Reinsch was stationed there and the outlook seemed promising. Then a curious witchcraft episode ensued which led to the withdrawal of the pastor. Monticello was not entirely abandoned, however, arrangements being made to care for it from Sherrill's Mount, when Pastor Rehwoldt took that charge in 1863.[22] In the course of a decade therefore seven parishes developed out of the

---

communicants, both in I. S. D. An account of the congregation is in K. M. 1865, 3 and 4, 29-31.

[21] Chronik der Gemeinde zu Tete des Morts, an undated document by M. Schueller in I. S. D. which gives the developments to 1860. Ausschuss Minutes, April 22, 1864, report Schueller's removal to Andrew. Stuermer gave an account of Van Buren in K. M. 1864, 1, 6-2, 12, but could not maintain himself there.

[22] The Oswald case may be traced in Synodalbericht 1861 and in Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, September 30; December 14, 1861; January 8-9; August 14; September 29, 1862; September 16, 1863; Minutes Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862. His status in the synod was not entirely clear, but he seems for a time to have held membership in the Galena conference. Both it and the Des Moines Conference complained about his practices. A little later he was listed as a member of the English Iowa Synod, Lutherische Zeitschrift IX, 10. The references given do not mention his location, but K. M. 1862, 11, 87 reports that he had originally served the Monticello area, while 12, 96 gives him as then stationed in Clinton County. The cited minutes of August 14 bring a visitation report by Grossmann which mentions a promising outlook at Monticello and less promising prospects at Fremont. The minutes of December 10, 1862 give Reinsch permission to leave and those of July 21-22, 1863, make the Sherrill's Mount arrangement. Reinsch reported the witchcraft episode in some detail in K. M. 1864, 7, 25-28 and 8, 29-31.

original missionary enterprises at Dubuque, and from some of them, new beginnings had been made which in time were to result in additional independent congregations.

The congregation founded by Deindoerfer at St. Sebald was experiencing steady growth and during this period held the foremost rank in the synod. As has been noted, the coming of the seminary meant a change in pastors and for the first year or two, Grossmann's heavy teaching duties must have interfered with his pastoral work. But after S. Fritschel returned to the seminary Grossmann was able to give the greater portion of his time to the congregation, although presidential duties took a great deal of his time. Deindoerfer's earlier missionary interest in Clayton County and the stationing of Schueller at Garnavillo have also been noted. The congregation formed there seems from the beginning to have had most of its members in Clayton Center, where a stone church was rising as early as 1856, Schueller moving there after its completion. The congregation soon proved intractable and Schueller left to go to Tete des Morts and connections with the synod were severed.[23] Meanwhile a congregation had been organized at Elkport, nearer to St. Sebald, after the seminary had moved there. Deindoerfer had visited there, but had never been able to serve it and Methodists had organized a church, but a request from Lutherans for services came to the seminary. G. Fritschel gathered and organized a group which erected a church. In 1859 Pastor Hoerlein was installed there and was also asked to serve remnants at Clayton Center and referred to prospects at Rapids Creek and Monona. He built up a parish of some promise at Elkport and Clayton Center, which languished after his removal to Wisconsin in 1862, but was later revived and became established.[24]

---

[23] The request of this congregation for membership in synod and synod's conditions have been noted in chapter V. A letter, Grossmann - Zion Congregation, Garnavillo, Dubuque, October 25, 1855, informs it that changes in its constitution are necessary for consent to Schueller's call and membership in synod. The letter and the call, dated September 16, 1855, are in I. S. D. Since Schueller served for several years and the congregation was received by synod, Chronik, 12, changes do seem to have been made. Perhaps, however, Schueller was lenient. Protokollbuch, Minutes Min. Conf., Wartburg, March 24-28, 1859, reports that the congregation had refused to accept provisions on the catechumentate, discipline, and

The men at the seminary also began to work in the area extending northwestward into Fayette County. After Pastor Koeberle had briefly been stationed at Eldorado, Deindoerfer was called in 1860 to serve an extensive parish, extending from West Union to Eldorado and Waucoma, and also serving Hawkeye and Calmar, the reason for his recall to Iowa being that as a member of the *Ausschuss* he was thus more accessible to St. Sebald where the other members resided. Deindoerfer or his successor also reached Lawler and Fort Atkinson, thus

---

unlimited pastoral tenure. The conference resolved to abandon the congregation and to advise loyal members to move away. Some did move to Kansas that year, *K. B.* II, 12, 96. The The church building and Schueller's plans for residing in Clayton Center are described by Missionary Schmidt who assisted Schueller during an illness in *K. M.* 1856, 10 and 11, 78.

[24] *Parochialbericht*, Elkport, March 1857, by G. Fritschel and January 1861 by J. Hoerlein in I. S. D. The latter is also an historical sketch. See also *Protokollbuch*, *Ausschuss*

establishing a large parish, which later formed several congregations.[25] Farther westward a large congregation at Maxfield in Bremer County was found, which had been served by a Missouri pastor, but had been left vacant. Not wishing to remain with Missouri, it tried the Ohio Synod in vain, and then after a visit by Candidate Sack, appealed to Iowa for a pastor. Pastor Kleinlein went there in 1859 and soon had a flourishing charge, which despite later troubles was in the next period to become a center of extensive missionary effort.[26] It may also have been the seminary which located a group of Lutherans at Spring Creek, now Jubilee, in Black Hawk County. As early as 1860 attempts were made to supply it with a pastor, but it was not until 1861 that Pastor Brueckner was stationed

---

Minutes, May 26-28, 1859, and April 28, 1862. G. Fritschel gives an account of his first visit in K. M. 1858, 10, 76-80.

[25] There is little documentary material on this parish. A parochial report by Deindoerfer dated November 1860 from Waucoma where Deindoerfer then lived (later at West Union) lists West Union, Eldorado and Waucoma. K. M. 1859, 6, 48, indicates that the seminary began missionary work in this area and Chronik, 29, mentions the assignment of Koeberle.

[26] A letter, Maxfield Congregation - Ministerium, April 18, 1859, sketches the previous history. Another Kleinlein - Grossmann, Maxfield, December 23, 1864, reports that the congregation voted him the unheard of salary of $500 at $10 for each of fifty families. Trouble had already occurred to which Grossmann referred in a report on a visitation at Maxfield, Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, August 14, 1862. Letters, Kleinlein - Grossmann, Maxfield, March 18, and April 19, 1861, and May 6, 1862, write that division had occurred, a number of families were excluded, property trouble ensued and that the opposition group had called another pastor and was threatening to build a church directly opposite. All letters are in I. S. D.

there also serving an extensive parish which extended to Independence and Fairbank.[27] At the end of the first decade Kleinlein was calling attention to a settlement near Parkersburg in Hardin County, where Koeberle and Brueckner were briefly stationed, but no successful start was made there until later.[28]

Another group of parishes thus developed from St. Sebald, most of which offered room for further expansion. Even while growth was slowly proceeding from established centers outward there were, however, plans for entirely new ventures. G. Fritschel made a report to the ministerial conference which met in connection with the convention of 1858 on prospects in southern Iowa. There were reports of German settlements there and Kleinlein, then a book agent, had actually visited some. The Lutherische Zeitschrift had referred to others.[29] Missouri was moving to get a start there. He suggested that someone ought to travel through the territory for as long as three or four months and to try to make connections so that synod could supply the area. If he himself could be released for that long he was willing to go. The conference thought a trip of four weeks ought to do, but even that was too long for G. Fritschel. Candidate Wachtel was suggested and several men were designated who might receive eventual calls.[30] It was Pastor List who took the trip later in 1858, visiting Sabula, Davenport, Muscatine, Iowa City, Millersburg and their vicinities, ending at Des Moines. In the spring of 1860, Missionary Kessler with student Hempeler made another trip through Maquoketa, DeWitt, Davenport, Buffalo, Mount Pleasant, Keosauqua, Oskaloosa, Des Moines and Millersburg. At Keosauqua and Millersburg they reported promising openings.[31]

---

[27] No account was found describing the first contact. Documentation can be found in Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, November 1-2, 1860; January 8-9; March 19-20; May 30-31, 1861, and in a letter, Brueckner - Grossmann, Spring Creek, August 24, 1861, in I. S. D.

[28] K. M. 1864, 1, 6 and 4 and 5, 26 refer to the Hardin County settlement as served by Kleinlein and to Koeberle's call there.

[29] There are references to Lutherans at Keosauqua in Lutherische Zeitschrift, I (1858), 1, 5; in Benton County, I, 3, 21, also for 1859, in Lyons, II, 7, 53; and in Millersburg, II, 25, 197. Both the latter are called to the attention of the Iowa Synod, though the English Iowa Synod, a member of the General Synod, may have been meant. Fritschel made a reference to such a note calling the attention of the Iowa Synod to Des Moines in 1858. The writer may have missed this. The notices usually refer to vacant congregations sometimes with requests for pastors.

The only immediate result of List's trip was the gathering of a group of interested Lutherans at Des Moines, who asked for List's services. Although his congregation at Rush Creek did not like to see him leave, it was decided that the strategic location of Des Moines made a mission there desirable and List's release was secured, so that he was able to go there in the spring of 1859. Promising prospects became dim, when it turned out that the most prominent prospective members belonged to a secret society. List was doubtful and wrote to Wartburg for advice, and at length received a negative reply. A congregation was organized, but it was small and engaged in a struggle for its bare existence for the rest of the period. It succeeded, however, and at length became securely established.[32]

---

[30] Protokollbuch, Minutes Min. Conf., Wartburg, September 13-18, 1858. Specific places mentioned by Fritschel were Muscatine, Davenport, Des Moines. Missouri was thinking of sending Reiseprediger, traveling missionaries, a term which will be employed hereafter.

[31] A report, which barely lists the points visited, but dwells on the organization of a congregation at Des Moines is in K. M. 1862, 2, 14, and runs on through 3 to 4, 28. A Bericht ueber Entstehung und Fortgang der evang. luth. Zionsgemeinde zu Des Moines, Iowa, January 1861 by List also reports the trip. It is in Deindoerfer papers. Kessler's trip is reported K. M. 1860, 8, 9 and 10, 59-80. Millersburg wished to call him, but the call did not arrive and Kessler went to Guttenberg. Missouri seems already to have had designs on Millersburg and took it over.

If Des Moines did not at once justify high hopes for itself, it did almost immediately become a center for further missionary effort. In 1860 List reported a vacant congregation at Germanville, the present Brighton, a considerable distance away in Jefferson County and suggested that Burk might go there. The latter did so and established relationships which induced the congregation to join the synod just before Burk left it.[33] List later also suggested that

---

[32] The materials listed in footnote 31 give much of this information. Letters, List - Grossmann, May 12; June 18; October 15, 1859, in I. S. D., deal with the initial problems. List's Parochialbericht for 1859-60 and for others the following years gives the figures. They are also in I. S. D. See also Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, June 1-2 and August 14, 1862, and March 14, 1863.

[33] Letter, List - Grossmann, August 9, 1860. Burk had lasted barely a year at Rush Creek and after considering a Wisconsin call which did not come, was at Garnavillo awaiting a call, and glad to go, letter, Burk - Grossmann, Garnavillo,

Keosauqua, to which Kessler had called attention, might be served from there. Kessler was to be sent there the next winter but could not go. Although Himmler visited it later, no congregation was established there.[34] Pastor Endres, then working independently, established himself in the vicinity of Oskaloosa, from where he made beginnings in Ottumwa and a number of other places. After his resignation, Pastor Bredow spent several years there, serving a number of places from which a congregation at Martinsburg, now Hedrick, resulted.[35] In the meantime List had taken over a Filiale at Monroe east of Des Moines, where Endres had also made the beginning, and

---

June 8, 1861, List's letter explained that one of his members moved to Germanville and noted that he had made an earlier suggestion. All letters in I. S. D. In 1864 the congregation was asked to change its constitution to bring it into harmony with that of the synod and it complied. Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, February 15; April 22; July 8, 1864.

[34] Kessler's second visit was delayed by a lack of reply from Keosauqua and then prevented by a change of plan. Ibid., Ausschuss Minutes, December 5-6, 1860; January 8-9; March 19-20; April 20, 1861. Himmler's visit is noted Ibid., July 24, 1861.

[35] Ibid., Ausschuss Minutes, July 24, 1861. Scattered references in the letters of Burk from Germanville and List from Des Moines refer to Endres and his work and mention other places for which they asked for men not available, Millersburg, Portland, Newton, etc., Bredow writes of his period in his Erinnerungen aus dem Leben und Wirken eines amerikanisch-lutherischen Pastors, Waterloo, 1904, and notes that Hedrick was the sole permanent result. K. M. 1862, 12, 89-92, gives descriptions of Germanville and Ottumwa in a report on visitations in Iowa and Bredow in K. M. 1863, 11 and 12, 95-100, mentions Ottumwa, Martinsburg, Soap Creek as having congregations as well as preaching places at Portland, Blakesburg, and Eddyville. An attempt to establish a mission at Bloomfield had failed.

also begun to work in Boone toward the north. For Boone he asked for help and received it promptly, Dr. Fikenscher being stationed there. The latter organized a congregation and traveled widely, serving groups at Dayton and Buffalo Grove, where he asked for an English pastor, and trying to get a foothold in Fort Dodge, besides making occasional trips through Story, Greene and Dallas Counties. All this collapsed, however, when Dr. Fikenscher returned to Germany and nothing permanent resulted.[36] In 1864 another attempt to establish an outpost was undertaken when B. Reinsch was stationed at Whitebreast, northeastward from Des Moines, but he withdrew within a year.[37]

While S. Fritschel was in Russia he wrote home that it would be possible to raise means to support as many as three traveling missionaries, Reiseprediger. There was much interest in such work and if the Reiseprediger were required to keep detailed diaries, which were then published in Europe, the interest would not flag. He strongly urged that an immediate beginning be made and reports sent to him while he was still in Europe, so that he could make publication arrangements.[38] The Ausschuss gave prompt consideration to the project. Since a considerable number of men were expected to become available that year from the seminary and from Germany it was necessary to find openings for them. It was felt, however, that men fresh from Germany were not suitable and that they should be placed with other pastors, who might have use for them and who would thus be enabled to estimate their abilities and qualifications.[39] Provision was made that two seminarians, Oetjens and Himmler, should travel through regions in northern Illinois and southern Iowa which were well populated. Both were candidates and were to be ordained before they started so that they could perform ministerial acts. Their instructions covered their territory and the approximate duration of their trip, conduct toward pastors of other synods and members of other denominations as well as requirements on which they were to insist if they received requests for pastors and required them to keep diaries and to send regular reports.[40]

---

[36] Letters, Fikenscher - Grossmann, Boonesboro, October 22, 1860; December 3, 1861; January 12, June, 4, June 12, December 12, 1862, in I. S. D. K. M. 1862, 11 and 12, 93, reports that Fikenscher's work was hampered by prevalence of secret societies and that Missouri took over the field near Boonesboro when many people turned away from Fikenscher because of his opposition to them.

[37] K. M. 1864, 4 and 5, 25-6, refers to the stationing of Reinsch. Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, August 10, 1864, reports that the Ausschuss held that the withdrawal had been unjustified, because youthful zeal and inexperience had led Reinsch to make unreasonable demands. The congregation received service for some years longer, however.

---

[38] S. Fritschel's undated letter from Reval to G. Fritschel and Grossmann, previously cited. Everything would depend on the reports which should be readable and detailed. He outlined a method whereby means could be made available to send one man at once and washed his hands of all responsibility if nothing were done and the plan failed later.

[39] Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, April 20; July 2; July 24; November 5, 1861. One of the new arrivals, Schorr, however, was assigned as Reiseprediger.

[40] Ibid., Ausschuss Minutes, April 20, May 30-31, 1861. The terms of the instructions are not specified. No doubt they were to require acceptance of the congregational constitution or its essential features as a condition of supply.

Himmler and Oetjens made the projected trip during the summer. They had very little money and travelled mainly on foot. Summer heat and wearisome travel made them footsore. Because of this Himmler soon left Oetjens and travelled down the river by boat to Fort Madison and then went to Keosauqua, where he concluded that secret societies were too strongly entrenched. He had more hopes for a German settlement near Portland, already visited by Kessler, which he served a few weeks and then turned over to Endres to serve from Oskaloosa. After visits with Endres and Burk he returned to Wartburg and was assigned elsewhere. Oetjens visited Sabula, Iowa, and Savanna, Illinois, and their vicinities, called at Lyons, Iowa, and then turned into Illinois, going through Sterling to Freeport. He too became footsore and returned to Dubuque and later to Wartburg. His report was not encouraging, little pure Lutheranism and what there was, was served by the Synod of Northern Illinois. A call might come from one unnamed place, but apparently did not.[41]

They were to be paid from a treasury for Reiseprediger, for which reliance undoubtedly was placed on the support promised by S. Fritschel.

[41] Ibid., Ausschuss Minutes, July 24, 1861, which reports on the experiences of both men and indicates that Himmler, then still in southern Iowa might serve Portland, if a pastor was desired there. Chronik, 46, simply notes that nothing substantial was achieved. Himmler's travels were reported in somewhat vivid detail in K. M. 1862, 5 and 6, 47; 7, 49-52; 8, 57-59, as well as in the account, previously cited, 2, 9-14. The former contains the statement that Endres served Portland.

The results of these travels were disappointing. The Reiseprediger had to work under handicaps of travel and were poorly supplied with funds and the territories covered offered few opportunities. Perhaps a thorough canvass of the river cities in Iowa might have uncovered better prospects, but Himmler did not make it. At any rate in 1863 Burk established a contact in Burlington, but declined a suggestion by the Ausschuss that he should go there, so that no independent parish was established at that time.[42] Independently of the Reiseprediger activities Pastor Stuermer in 1861 was assigned to the territory served by Dr. Fikenscher and did some work in Fort Dodge as well as in Monroe, but could not maintain himself.[43] Pastor Endres, after his resignation, got a foothold in Fort Dodge, but was not received back into synodical membership.[44]

The synod put a good deal of effort into attempts to establish itself in southeastern and south central Iowa, although the results were rather meager. While the original impetus has been traced back to the seminary and G. Fritschel's suggestion at the Synod of 1858, it should be noted that the later efforts were urged by List, Burk and Fikenscher, who felt their isolated position keenly and felt that the synod should concentrate its efforts in Iowa, rather than disperse them widely. They believed that opportunities were abundant and that the men who were available should be sent to follow them up and fill in the gaps which now separated the scattered outposts. The fear that Missouri would use its more abundant manpower to preempt the field, if Iowa efforts lagged, so that the opportunity, if not used now, would be lost forever, also played a part.[45] The synod had, however, already dispersed its efforts widely and had calls for its men from various areas. Moreover, the optimistic outlook of the men in the southern field was not always justified. German settlements were not as numerous in the south as in northern Iowa and many of the settlers had a unionist outlook, or were unchurched to such an extent that the strict Lutheranism of the Iowa Synod made no strong appeal to them. No Lutheran Church, in fact, has ever been able to develop great strength in the southern section of Iowa.

---

[42] Letter, Burk - Grossmann, Germanville, April 10, 1863, in I. S. D. A request for a Lutheran church came from an Evangelical congregation. See also Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, March 14, 1863.

[43] Letters, Fikenscher - Grossmann, Boonesboro, December 3 and December 27, 1861, in I. S. D. See also Ausschuss Minutes, July 24; December 14, 1861; January 9-10, 1862. He had been designated for Monroe, which became a Filiale of Des Moines.

[44] See footnote 9. Missouri received him and took over this field also.

---

[45] A letter, List - Grossmann, Des Moines, September 28, 1861, in I. S. D. develops these ideas clearly. Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, March 26, 1862, indicates that the Des Moines Conference formed by these pastors had requested that the missionary work of the synod be confined to the state of Iowa, and that the Ausschuss replied that synod would be guided by the doors opened by God.

Late in 1861 another trial was given to the Reiseprediger idea. The Ausschuss arranged that Oetjens was to take another trip into Minnesota and that Schorr was to accompany him. Late in the year Schorr made the trip alone. He visited Albert Lea, Rochester and vicinity and found one promising opening. Since, however, he had led the people to believe that a Reiseprediger supported from abroad could supply them for a time, it was decided not to send him back to ask the people to form a congregation and support their pastor themselves. As a result the trip led to no tangible result and work in Minnesota was delayed for several years.[46] Through two of the Reiseprediger, who had not won a new foothold on their travels, a new parish was, however, to come into existence in northeastern Iowa. In addition to the churches already noted as established in that area several other attempts had previously been made without leading to success. Missionary Kessler had once been at Guttenberg for a brief time, but nothing was accomplished there in the entire period.[47] Pastor Endres before his first withdrawal from Synod had been working at Prairie du Chien, on both sides of the river, but the field had then been abandoned by him. There were, however, requests for service from there and Pastor Himmler was sent there in the fall of 1861. After Schorr's return he was also sent there and in consequence congregations were established by Himmler at Prairie du Chien and by Schorr at McGregor. Both were small and struggling and were soon combined into one parish, from which Monona also may have received service.[48]

---

[46] Ibid., Ausschuss Minutes, July 24, 1861; March 26, 1862. In the next year Schorr proposed to a conference that the group be visited again, Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, July 7-11, 1862, and Hoerlein volunteered to do so. But the Ausschuss a little later instructed Missionary Kessler, temporarily available, to do so and to suggest the calling of a pastor, Ausschuss Minutes, August 14, 1862. He may have done so and found them unwilling. The place is not named, but may have been in the vicinity of Spring Valley. There is a rather unsatisfactory report of Schorr's trip in K. M. 1862, 9 and 10, 66-77.

[47] Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, December 5-6, 1860.

Clearly the Reiseprediger experiment in 1861 had led to no great results. Lack of adequate means was the great problem. The Ausschuss understood that sending men on foot, in the heat of summer, and without adequate traveling funds, imposed great handicaps. Its members were divided over what should be done. Two of them thought that Reiseprediger should be maintained, but sent only to thickly populated areas, where congregations might be established relatively soon and held that European interest maintained by favorable reports would make that possible. Two others held that advances should be made from already established centers, serving small and scattered groups as well as larger ones. The available means would permit only occasional exploratory journeys, by students, candidates or pastors on brief leaves, not permanent Reiseprediger who would have to be supported entirely from synodical funds. The decision was to use the latter method and to appeal to the conferences to survey their areas and make suggestions to the Ausschuss.[49]

---

[48] For Endres see Ausschuss Minutes, March 28, 1859, which also mention Monona, and K. M. 1861, 9, 70-71, for Himmler's commission those of November 5, 1861, and Schorr's March 26, 1862. Other references are Ibid., September 30, 1861, giving a request for service, January 9-10; April 28, 1862. A joint call to Schorr is noted April 13, 1863. Himmler left because support was inadequate and Schorr had to support himself by teaching school.

Some such endeavors were made. Already Dr. Fikenscher had sent a report on a trip which he had made to Omaha and the Missouri river region, but nothing was done there for some time to come. Pastor Schueller reported on some of his former members, now in the vicinity of St. Paul, who desired synod to supply them with a pastor. He was instructed to visit them, but nothing came of that either.[50] In 1863 Pastor Kluge from Elkport was sent on a journey through northern Iowa and into Minnesota, visiting Howard and Mitchell Counties in Iowa and Spring Valley in Minnesota, but though he found some interested groups, his reports were not encouraging and again no immediate results were obtained.[51] An isolated attempt to begin a mission in Kansas may conclude this sketch of missionary activity centering in Iowa. The suggestion of founding a seminary colony there in 1857 has been noted. In 1859 a number of members of the congregation at Clayton Center migrated to Kansas. With them went Pastor Sack, who had just graduated from the seminary. He established a small congregation with these migrants near Waubonsa and was to minister to scattered Lutherans in the territory. However, Sack died almost immediately and could not be replaced. In the next year the migrants issued an appeal for material aid which was published in the Kirchen-Blatt and got a considerable response. The orphaned congregation was not again supplied and apparently went to Missouri.[52]

---

[49] Ibid.,.Ausschuss Minutes, July 24, 1861, which notes the difficulties, and December 14, 1861. Chronik, 56-7, notes that the support which S. Fritschel had hoped to secure, did not materialize, although some was coming from Russia. The disappointing results of 1861 may have brought this about.

[50] For Dr. Fikenscher's trip see Ausschuss Minutes, December 14, 1861. Schorr was designated to go to the area indicated in the following spring, but as noted he went to McGregor. On Schueller see Ausschuss Minutes, August 14 and November 3, 1862.

[51] Letter, Kluge - Grossmann, Elkport, June 13, 1863. The letter is fragmentary and Kluge may have gone farther. He was obviously a pastor on a brief leave, since he returned

---

to Elkport, though he may have been interested in finding a place he could serve, since he complained of poor support in Elkport. The visit in Minnesota may have been a result of Schorr's earlier trip. That the region was not forgotten is indicated by a letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, West Union, November 4, 1864, which urges that someone, perhaps one of the returned Indian missionaries, should be sent to the people Schorr had found, for it was not just a matter of serving a number of families, but of getting a foothold in a state where the synod should have one. Both in I. S. D.

[52] K. B. II, 12, 96, reports the settlement and the death of Sack; III, 11, 83, carries an appeal for aid. Contributions totalling $73.04 and quantities of supplies are receipted Ibid., and IV, 3, 24; 6, 48; 8, 64. Letters, Schueller - Grossmann, Tete des Morts, March 1 and May 16, 1861, in I. S. D. report details about the contributions and their distribution and note that a good deal was lost in transmission. Schueller as former pastor of Clayton Center had a personal interest in the recipients, and P. Michel the appellant, had been a prominent member and delegate to the convention of 1858. The death of Sack was the first death of a pastor of the new synod. Chronik, 27, notes it and adds that the migrants had requested a pastor and that Sack had volunteered. K. M. 1860, 1 and 2, 10-16, gives an obituary and a letter from Sack

If the missionary activities of the Iowa Synod in Iowa and in immediately adjacent areas were extensive during the first decade, it did not follow that other areas were entirely neglected. It will be remembered that a group of congregations in Wisconsin had been acquired from Buffalo in 1856. Deindoerfer had a charge at Madison and another at Westport. By 1860 the parish also included congregations at Springdale and Blue Mounds and preaching places at Middleton and Vermont.[53] Nearby was Cottage Grove, which became vacant when Doerfler went to Toledo in 1857 and was served for a time from Madison. Deindoerfer, however, was given an assistant in student Kluge to handle the extra work and when the latter was ready to graduate, Cottage Grove called him and thereafter formed a separate parish again.[54] The other congregations received from Buffalo were Lewistown, to which Beckel was assigned and

---

describing the journey to Kansas, suggesting that Sack was the first Lutheran pastor there. Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, September 30, 1861, notes an appeal from Michel for a pastor and his unwillingness to join a Missouri congregation. The Ausschuss advised him to join, or if his conscience did not permit that, to move into an Iowa congregation. Synod could not send a Reiseprediger into a region where another Lutheran church already had one. While that principle was sound, its application to a mission founded under the auspices of the synod was rather curious.

[53] Parochialbericht, Madison, 1860, in I. S. D. Deindoerfer described the Madison parish soon after his arrival there in K. M. 1856, 6 and 7, 53-6; 8 and 9, 70-72, and again several years later, 1861, 6, 41-4.

[54] Doerfler gave descriptions of Cottage Grove and his work there in K. M. 1857, 4, 31-2, and 1859, 10 and 11, 73-4. An account of it by Deindoerfer is in 1861, 7, 49-51 and by Hoerlein in 1864, 34-40. The arrangements concerning Kluge are described 1858, 4, 31-2, and 1859, 10 and 11, 73-4.

Westfield, now Loganville, for which Weege had been intended, but which was served by Deindoerfer and Doerfler after his death.

The congregation at Lewistown was not in sympathy with synodical ideals and although a second group at Portage was reached from there, numbers in both places so dwindled that Pastor Beckel took over Westfield after a year, serving the remnants from there. Since there was much work at Westfield, after a time Lewistown and Portage again became independent under Pastor Rohrlack, but removals and strict discipline, so weakened it that Rohrlack too gave up the parish to become Beckel's successor at Westfield. No permanent development thus came out of these beginnings.[55] At Westfield a fairly strong congregation was gradually built up under Beckel and small groups were served from there at Reedsburg, Honey Creek, Willow Creek and Mill Creek. Attempts were soon made to divide this large parish. Pastor Wachtel, who had served as Beckel's assistant for a time, took over Honey Creek as a separate parish, but withdrawals soon compelled him to leave, Honey Creek returning to the Westfield parish and receiving service from Sauk at a later time. Pastor Rohrlack had established another separate parish in Mill Creek, Willow Creek and Ash Creek in Richland County, which Wachtel took over, after Rohrlack had left for Portage, but after a time he had to abandon this field likewise. In Westfield itself there was a good deal of difficulty under Rohrlack. Attempts to solve the trouble by dividing the congregation were only partially successful, and one part left synod after Rohrlack's withdrawal, while the other part remained.[56]

---

[55] Chronik, 17, Ausschuss Minutes, September 30, 1861; August 14, 1862, K. M. 1861, 7, 51-6.

Missionary Schmidt began work in a new field at Sauk in 1860 and also worked in the vicinity at Harrisburg and elsewhere, but with no great numerical success. Honey Creek from Westfield was transferred to this parish, but it remained difficult. Schmidt could not maintain himself there and his successor, Himmler, also had trouble, but the field was served throughout the period, though it was to be lost later.[57] Another new mission was undertaken by Pastor Bredow in 1861 at Oxford, some distance beyond Portage, but it too remained small, and was abandoned when Bredow went to Iowa.[58] Pastor Wachtel after an unsuccessful start at Mill Creek and vicinity established another parish at Muscoda, extending to Marion, Fennimore and Boscobel, of which the latter was destined to flourish.[59]

---

[56] Chronik, 17, reports organization and Beckel's call. Bericht ueber Entstehung und Fortgang der ev. luth. St. Johannis gemeinde in Westfield, Wisconsin, and Parochialbericht Westfield 1860-61 by Beckel in I. S. D. report progress. The difficulties are recorded in Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, November 4, 1863; February 15, April 22, July 8, 1864. See also letters, Rohrlack - Grossmann, Loganville, February 24, 1864; November 7, 1864; Hoerlein - Grossmann, July 6, 1864; Kessler - Grossmann, January 10 and January 16, 1865; Klindworth - --, March 8, 1865, in I. S. D. The Westfield difficulties seem to have been caused largely by tactlessness on the part of Rohrlack, several of the letters express the opinion that if he would leave they could be overcome. Deindoerfer gave a description of Westfield in K. M. 1861, 8, 62-4, which also discusses Honey Creek and Wachtel's difficulties there, while in 9, 68-9, he dealt with the Mill Creek area. Deindoerfer also wrote Beilage to Ausschuss Minutes, September 29, 1862, in Protokollbuch, which also deals with these parishes.

[57] Parochialbericht 1860 contained in a letter, Schmidt - --, November 27, 1860, in I. S. D., K. M. 1861, 9, 70-72; Deindoerfer, Beilage with Ausschuss Minutes, September 29, 1862. There was considerable trouble over Schmidt's transfer, Ibid., and November 3, December 10, 1862. See also a letter, Himmler - Ausschuss, Honey Creek, June 1, 1863, in I. S. D.

A good deal of effort thus was put into the Wisconsin expansion program, although it followed the pattern of reaching out beyond established centers, rather than that of Reiseprediger work. Difficulties, however, were numerous and losses high. At the end of the first decade the number of parishes was still only four. Cottage Grove and Madison were securely established and the latter had reached out to serve a considerable area in its vicinity. The new parish at Muscoda held considerable promise. Westfield after reaching considerable importance, had met an unfortunate setback and was combined with the meager field at Sauk.

The eastern area was also still small, but it experienced a rather greater growth, despite the losses which followed the termination of friendly relations with Buffalo. It has been noted that congregations had been established at Newport and St. Clair, of which St. Clair was lost, and at Swan Creek, which also was lost for the time being.[60] Brueckner had undertaken a mission at Sanilac, which received service from Newport after his removal to Iowa. The congregation did not like the arrangement and was exceedingly anxious to secure Brueckner's return. Failing to secure this, it went to Buffalo for a time.[61] Newport was disturbed for a time by difficulties with Bauer, its pastor, but under Pastor Ide it flourished. A mission was begun in Port Huron, which was served by Ide also.[62]

---

[58] Letter, Bredow - Grossmann, Portage City, September 17, 1861, in I. S. D. Before Rohrlack went to Westfield, this area was placed in his charge, Ausschuss Minutes, August 14, 1862.

[59] The first Parochialbericht in I. S. D. is for 1865, but Wachtel had left Mill Creek in 1863 and Deindoerfer gives the organization date for Boscobel as 1864, Geschichte, 351. Wachtel does not seem to have been a Reiseprediger, but so far as the records go, he seems to have located this field by his own efforts. Deindoerfer had remarked in 1860 that there was a great need for Reiseprediger missions in Wisconsin, but none was sent to that state in 1861 when this method of work was tried. See K. M. 1861, 10, 74.

---

[60] A group at Swan Creek wished to withdraw from the congregation and call an Iowa pastor, but the Ausschuss held that they had no valid reason to do so and refused to grant the request unless Buffalo should make demands violating the conscience of the dissidents, Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, July 24 and November 1, 1861.

[61] Letters, Brueckner - Grossmann, Sanilacmills, February 28 and October 5, 1859, indicate that Sanilac was difficult territory. Some of the trouble was due to unwillingness to give support to pastor and synod. Brueckner's proposed return was dealt with in Ausschuss Minutes, November 5, and December 14, 1861; January 9-10; March 26, 1862. Letters having reference to the matter are: Congregation - Grossmann, undated, unsigned; Minna Graunstaedt - Grossmann, February 21, 1863; Grossmann - Sanilac congregation, February 8, 1862; Brueckner - Grossmann, March 28; June 10, 1862; April 20, 1863. A letter, Ide - Grossmann, January 6, 1864, reports installation of a Buffalo candidate at Sanilac. All letters are in I. S. D. In the next period Sanilac must have returned for a time, for Brueckner served it a second time, later after he was ousted by the congregation, it left again. On Sanilac origins, see K. M. 1859, 4, 29-32; 5, 33-7.

[62] The Newport difficulties are dealt with in Ausschuss Minutes, January 8-9; March 19-20; April 20; May 30-31; July 2, 1861. Those of August 14 and November 3, 1862, report on progress at Port Huron. K. M. 1863, 6, 45, 46, expressed hope that Ide's activities could be extended into Canada.

Salem Church at Toledo, which acquired membership as a consequence of the break with Buffalo as discussed in Chapter VI, under Pastor Doerfler was to become the center of missionary enterprise in the East. Toledo was a growing city and offered missionary opportunities in itself and besides this Doerfler found others farther afield. He also became interested in founding an orphanage in Toledo. As a result, by 1861 he was asking for help. Candidate Kroenke was sent and before the year was out, had found a group of unchurched Lutherans at Riga, where he opened a school and then founded a congregation. Kroenke was to serve this group all his life. An able man, he had some training in architecture, and was to render considerable service to the synod through this aptitude and through an interest in paramentics. He also served Ottawa Lake, nearby, which Doerfler had organized, until in later years it was to become an independent congregation.[63] As assistant to Doerfler, Kroenke was immediately replaced by Candidate Oetjens, who was assigned to Summerfield, another mission served by Doerfler. Since this charge was too small to support him, Oetjens found another opening at Ida. At that place a Missouri *Filiale* existed, the people of which were dissatisfied with service given them and delay in organizing a parish of their own. The result was that a group sought the services of Oetjens, who after some hesitation agreed to serve them, thus establishing a new parish in which Ida was the main congregation and Summerfield *Filiale*.[64]

---

[63] A letter, Doerfler - Grossmann, August 15, 1861, describes his heavy burden and mentions three groups whom he was serving, besides his own congregation. Another letter August 24, 1861, asks that Kroenke be sent immediately. Die Gruendung der Ev. Luth. Dreieinigkeitsgemeinde in Riga, Michigan, an undated MS. by Kroenke gives an account of the beginnings there and indicates that a few families had previously been served by a Missouri pastor, who rather unwillingly gave them up when they wished to join Kroenke's congregation. A letter, Kroenke - Grossmann, Riga, February 12, 1862, asks for ordination and installation and refers to Ottawa Lake. A letter, Bauer - Grossmann, Neuendettelsau, March 8, 1861, calls attention to Kroenke's architectural training, and suggests that the synod might make use of it. All of these documents are in I. S. D. There is also information on Riga in a letter from Kroenke printed K. M. 1863, 10, 79-80; 11 and 12, 92-95.

Doerfler continued to ask for men, suggesting the elder Reinsch and Schorr, neither of whom was made available. His point was that the East offered better missionary opportunities than the West, because it was more densely settled. He held that there were numerous groups of Germans, if able pastors were sent congregations could be developed.[65] At Toledo itself Doerfler had plans for a second church, in connection with which an orphanage was to be established. The location chosen lay somewhat to the east, in a rural area, at Oregon. To this place Beckel was assigned, since his health made a transfer from Wisconsin advisable, and a congregation came into existence which he was to serve for the rest of his life.[66] In 1863, Doerfler founded St. John's Church in another part of Toledo, where there were numerous Germans.

---

[64] Kroenke's letter, cited in the preceding footnote notes the arrival of Oetjens. A letter, Oetjens - Grossmann, Riga, April 1, 1862, discusses the beginnings. *Der geschichtliche Verlauf, der Sache zu Ida Station, Michigan*, August 1, 1862, gives a detailed story which indicates that Oetjens saw the Missouri pastor involved, Hattstaedt at Monroe, and that the latter refused to release his people because Oetjens was a heretic. Oetjens did not seek to alienate people from Hattstaedt, but when he found that some were determined to leave, he advised them simply to withdraw. After this had been done, Missouri attempted to provide more adequate service, but the people found even that inadequate and refused to return. A letter, Speckhardt - Oetjens, Hillsdale, May 5, 1862, contains complaints of Oetjens' conduct which are rejected or excused in a reply, Oetjens - Speckhardt, Ida, May 13, 1862. *Auszug aus dem Protokoll der Toledo Conferenz vom 26.* February 1862, shows that the conference advised Oetjens to see Hattstaedt and to offer the cession of Summerfield to Missouri if they would made an adequate arrangement. Oetjens nowhere mentions making this offer. A letter, Oetjens - *Ausschuss*, Ida, January 3, 1863, deals with the withdrawal from the Missouri *Filiale*. All these documents are in I. S. D. *Protokollbuch*, *Ausschuss* Minutes, September 29, 1862, is critical of the conduct of Oetjens and the Toledo conference in acting on a matter involving intersynodical relations without consulting the *Ausschuss* and resolves to redress wrong, if wrong was done. Those of February 4, 1863, resolve to let the matter rest on basis of fuller information, unless Missouri should ask for an explanation. See also *Chronik*, 64.

---

[65] Letters, Doerfler - Grossmann, Toledo, January 2; April 23; July 3, 1862; Schorr - Grossmann, McGregor, May 2, 1862. Reinsch apparently had been designated for Toledo, but reassigned to Monticello, Iowa, after a visit there. Schorr was serving a very small charge at McGregor, which could be and later was served from Prairie du Chien, but had signed a contract to teach public school. He thus earned a living and sought broader opportunities, which did not materialize. Doerfler thought this a waste of badly needed manpower. He also thought people more receptive in the East, K. M. 1863, 1, 8. All the letters are in I. S. D.

[66] Doerfler's letter to Grossmann, August 15, 1861, previously cited, refers to three unnamed charges which he served beyond Salem Church. Two of them were probably Ottawa Lake and Summerfield, turned over to Kroenke and Oetjens, while the third was probably this east side mission to which Kroenke referred in connection with the orphanage in a letter to Grossmann, Toledo, St. Michael's Day, 1861. Doerfler seems to have wished to have an assistant, so that he personally could take charge of the orphanage, but the congregation was not wholeheartedly in accord. Beckel was to take charge of the orphanage and serve Oregon. Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, November 5, 1861; January 9-10; April 28; August 14; September 29, 1862. From them it seems that Oetjens had been sent in place of Reinsch. Beckel was not given charge of the orphanage by Doerfler. Letter, Beckel - Grossmann, Toledo, January 26, 1864. All letters in I. S. D.

Candidate Vogel, who had been sent to Ohio, where he found himself unable to work as planned, was directed there by the Toledo conference. He organized a congregation and was installed there, but found conditions among the working class which lived there so difficult that he became discouraged and left his charge without explanation. Deindoerfer then was called, and though finding the work difficult, put the congregation on its feet.[67]

Outside of Toledo, relatively little was accomplished in Ohio during this period. Pastor Schmidt after withdrawing from Sauk in Wisconsin, was inactive for a short period, and then in 1863 was directed to Pettisville, Ohio, by the Eastern conference, where for a while he entertained so much hope that he asked for an assistant for the vicinity. Vogel was sent to him, but was unable to get a foothold and Schmidt too found himself compelled to withdraw from Pettisville in 1864.[68] In that same year, however, a congregation of the Ohio Synod at

---

[67] Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, February 15; April 22, 1864; letters, Doerfler - Grossmann, Toledo, December 2, 1864, which reports that Vogel disappeared so abruptly that for a time foul play was feared, and Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Toledo, February 1865, which notes his arrival and the fact that Vogel had become his successor at West Union. Later difficulties are given in numerous letters, Deindoerfer - Grossmann from Toledo from 1865 on. All letters in I. S. D.

[68] Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, September 16; November 4, 1863; April 22, 1864. A letter, A. von Schwarz - G. Fritschel, Wartburg, July 10, 1864, remonstrates against an idea that the latter leave Wartburg and go to Toledo. Another, Schieferdecker - Grossmann, August 3, 1864, also refers to such a plan. Both in I. S. D. Perhaps another mission in Toledo was contemplated, since the Vogel difficulties had not yet occurred. None was founded, and the plan not carried out.

Perrysburg, which had been vacant and had asked for an Iowa pastor, was supplied with Candidate Kaeding. The original intent seems merely to have been to give vacancy service, but the congregation issued a call which Kaeding was permitted to accept, Ohio acquiescing under protest. Kaeding almost at once asked for assistance to serve a rural area and a vacant congregation at Bryan.[69]

Schmidt, after his withdrawal from Pettisville, went to Detroit, where he organized Holy Cross Church. This new start in the city in which S. Fritschel had served a Buffalo congregation was undertaken by Schmidt on his own account, but gave Iowa a foothold in an important center. The congregation remained small and burdened with financial difficulties for many years.[70] Near Mount Clemens a congregation had been abandoned by a Buffalo pastor, and was served by Pastor Dunsing, who had had training in Missouri institutions, but had withdrawn from that synod. Contacts had been made with him which led him to go to Wartburg for study and examination. He was then assigned to the congregation and after a Missouri protest regarding separation of this group from a Missouri congregation some years earlier had been investigated, was installed in 1863.[71] Also in 1863, Candidate Prottengeier was assigned to Pastor Ide at Newport for the Newport-Port Huron field.[72]

---

[69] Letters, Beckel - Grossmann, Toledo, July 7; Doerfler - Grossmann, July 8, 1864; Schieferdecker - Grossmann, Altenburg, August 3, 1864, in I. S. D. expressed doubts of Kaeding's qualifications for a delicate position and dislike of giving offense to Ohio. See also Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, August 10, 1864. Chronik, 72, reports that Ohio was displeased.

[70] There is no record of any direction to Schmidt to go to Detroit. Doerfler's cited letter to Grossmann, December 2, 1864, refers to the purchase of a church. I. S. D. contains a call issued in the name of Salem Church (the original name) to Schmidt, Detroit, July 2, 1864. Schmidt in 1873 went to Germany to raise money for the congregation. A statement on his congregational policies which appeared in K. M. drew a venomous rejoinder from Missouri Pastor Huegli in Detroit, charging him with alienating members who were personal relatives and containing the old Missouri claim, that Schmidt had no right to start a congregation in territory occupied by other synods. Lutheraner XXIX, 17, 133; 21, 164-66.

The eastern field thus experienced considerable growth and by the end of the decade had nine parishes with ten pastors. Doerfler's observation that greater population density made the establishment of congregations easier than in Iowa was correct. It was also true, however, that few areas in the East were entirely neglected by Lutheran missionary enterprise. Because of this, vacant congregations could sometimes be taken over, already organized, but clashes with other church bodies were likely to result. When the missionaries in the main were youthful and inexperienced as well as eager, it was not always possible for a remote church government to exercise proper restraints in such cases.

---

[71] *Protokollbuch*, *Ausschuss* Minutes, July 21-22; August 31; September 16; November 4; December 6, 1863. The investigation revealed that no unatoned wrongs remained to be adjusted. *Chronik*, 68-70, indicates that Missouri declined to enter into discussion of regulations concerning practice in such cases. Dunsing had studied at Wartburg for a time before his examination and is listed as one of its graduates. *K. M.* 1864, 1, 4. 4 and 5, 28.

[72] *Ausschuss* Minutes, July 21-22; August 31, 1863.

In Missouri and Southern Illinois, there was one more area in which the young Iowa Synod obtained a foothold in its first decade. It will be remembered that the Missouri Synod had, in 1857, excluded Pastor G. Schieferdecker from its membership for chiliast views. Schieferdecker at the time was serving the old congregation at Altenburg, Missouri, where Concordia Seminary had been located before its removal to St. Louis. There was a group in the congregation which adhered to Schieferdecker and was driven out with him, being denied all claim to the church property, a denial which the courts subsequently upheld. The group then formed a new congregation and built its own church, retaining Schieferdecker as pastor.[73] It has been noted that Schieferdecker in 1859 became a member of the Iowa Synod. Correspondence had led the leaders of synod to the conclusion that his chiliast views were in substantial accord with their own and his attendance at the conference in Galena in 1859 had satisfied the members of the ministerium. The congregation also joined the synod and thus an outpost to the southward was obtained.[74]

---

[73] The story of the origin of the schism at Altenburg is told in K. B. IV, 7, 33-35. Schieferdecker told his side of the story in K. M. 1860, 11 and 12; 1861, 13. Missouri's side is presented in its Synodalbericht 1867. There is a reply by Pastor Beyer to the article in the K.B. in Lutheraner, XVII, 26, 203-5.

[74] Schieferdecker's account in K. M. indicates that there was correspondence, 1860, 11 and 12, 86. Protokollbuch, Minutes Min. Conf., Galena, September 16-20, 1859, records his presence as guest and his reception into membership. The earliest letter from Schieferdecker preserved in I. S. D. is

Schieferdecker soon began to call the attention of the synod to openings in his vicinity. It may have been he who referred the congregation at Kornthal, near Jonesboro, Illinois, to the synod, which in 1858 sent a call to List, who returned it, and in 1859 called Doerfler, when he was to be called away from Toledo. Later in that year Candidate H. Hempeler accepted the call. The region was malarial and the health of pastors was adversely affected. Hempeler soon had to leave for these reasons. Under his successor, Heckel, the congregation experienced dissension, but became firmly established.[75] Schieferdecker was already looking farther afield, suggesting a missionary trip to southern Illinois, and reporting vacant

---

dated December 30, 1858, and there is one other preceding his reception, but neither of them deal with his chiliast views. It may be conjectured that he got in touch with the Iowa leaders in 1858 if not earlier, for the first letter on December 30, 1858, referred to orders for the Kirchen-Blatt for members and discussed a letter from Loehe.

[75] No record of the original application from Jonesboro could be found, but a brief notice in K. M. 1859, 648 about a congregation abandoned by Missouri because of chiliasm may refer to it. A letter, Schieferdecker - --, January 20, 1859, refers to List's refusal and promises to handle the call to Doerfler. See also a letter, List - Grossmann, Rush Creek, January 20, 1859, which mentions his intention to decline and a letter from Schieferdecker, which may have contained the original offer. For Doerfler see also the account in chapter VI. A call signed by Schieferdecker and the Jonesboro vestry is dated October 23, 1859. Illness of Hempeler's wife is alluded to as cause for his leaving in a letter, Schieferdecker - Grossmann, Altenburg, October 4, 1860, and another, November 8, 1860, refers to Heckel as successor. A letter, Josef Mayer - Ministerium, May 10, 1861, deals with dissension over liturgical arrangements. A report on a visitation in a letter, Schieferdecker - Grossmann, Altenburg, November 19, 1861, describes an adjustment on liturgy. Letters, Heckel - Grossmann, April 22, 1862, and July 1, 1863, note new difficulties and a schism. All letters and documents cited are in I. S. D.

congregations in his vicinity in Missouri. Of these he suggested a charge at Jackson, Missouri, as requiring immediate attention. Missionary Doederlein then returning from the Indian Mission, was assigned there and served the congregation through the war years. Doederlein, however, was converted to Missouri views by neighboring pastors of that synod, and when he withdrew in 1864, the congregation was lost also.[76] Near Jonesboro, at Metropolis, Illinois, another parish was founded in 1860, to which Candidate J. G. Hempeler was assigned. It too lay in the malarial region and was beset with internal difficulties, which kept it small.[77] Preaching places were established at Dongola and Golconda by Hempeler and Heckel and the latter also began work in Cairo, which subsequently received its own pastor, but was not permanently held. Two already existing congregations, one of them in Paducah and one in the vicinity asked Hempeler for services and soon requested a pastor. The elder Reinsch went to Paducah after his withdrawal from Monticello, Iowa, in 1863 and worked in that vicinity, later establishing himself at Golconda, Illinois. At his request his brother was stationed in Paducah in 1864. Parishes then were established both at Golconda and at Paducah and served for some time to come, but neither was held permanently.[78]

---

[76] Letters, Schieferdecker - Grossmann, Altenburg, July 8, 1859; January 4, 26; February 15, 1860, report on Jackson and negotiations with Doederlein. A call to Doederlein was dated February 27, 1860. Numerous later letters of Schieferdecker refer to Doederlein and Missouri, and letters, Doederlein - Grossmann, Jackson, January 23, 1861; October 28, 1861, and to Pastoral Conference, Dubuque, August 1, 1862, all in I. S. D., give his position. His withdrawal is discussed in Synodalbericht, 1864, 29-37.

[77] Chronik, 34, indicates **that** the call to Hempeler came through his brother at Jonesboro, who thus probably located this mission. A letter, Schieferdecker - Grossmann, Altenburg, January 26, 1860, speaks of J. G. Hempeler as assigned to the region without mention of Metropolis, but another of June 6, 1860, implies that he was there by that time. A parochial report for 1860 lists Metropolis as not yet organized. A letter, J. G. Hempeler - Grossmann, Metropolis, February 22, 1862, reports a schism and alludes

Like the eastern area, this region was rather far removed from the center of the synod, but Schieferdecker working in close harmony with Grossmann seems to have maintained contacts effectively. Almost every mission was beset with difficulties, due largely to the circumstance that in most cases entire congregations were taken over and elements which did not agree with the policies of the synod seceded or withdrew when their character became apparent. Despite all difficulties, however, an active center of missionary endeavors had become established.

---

to poor health. All documents are in I. S. D. It may be noted that in 1865 a second congregation was organized in the vicinity of Metropolis which subsequently became an independent parish.

[78] K. M. 1862, 11, 81-6, contains a letter from Heckel which indicates that he was an active missionary and refers to both Cairo and Paducah, while the assignment of G. Reinsch to Paducah is noted in 1863, 6, 44. See also a letter, Schieferdecker - Grossmann, Altenburg, June 13, 1862. Protokollbuch has references to these places in Ausschuss Minutes, September 16; November 4; December 6, 1863; February 15; April 22; July 8, 1864. Candidate Kaeding, who was Schieferdecker's assistant for a time was at one time assigned to Paducah, but did not go there. See also letters, J. G. Hempeler - Grossmann, December 8, 1862; April 13, 1863. Golconda is mentioned only in the withdrawal letter of the elder Reinsch, G. Reinsch - Grossmann, Golconda, December 9, 1865. All cited letters are in I. S. D. The congregation

By the end of the decade the area in which synod worked had been expanded far beyond the original nuclei at Dubuque and St. Sebald. These congregations had become surrounded with new parishes and in Des Moines an additional Iowa center had become established. Other centers were located at Madison, Toledo and Altenburg, and from each expansion was proceeding. Parishes were located in Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, Missouri and Kentucky. Not every mission established during the decade was destined to succeed, it had already been necessary to withdraw from some fields and some of those still held in 1864 had to be abandoned in succeeding years. In most cases, however, firm foundations had been laid on which flourishing parishes were developing which often in their turn became centers of missionary endeavor reaching farther afield.

---

at Golconda was served for a number of years longer, before it was abandoned. The documents make it clear that confessional Lutheran consciousness was weak in this area and that difficulties and schisms occurred in all the parishes.

CHAPTER VIII

PRACTICE: SELECT GROUP IDEOLOGY 1854-1864

While the Iowa Synod by 1864 was serving some thirty parishes with perhaps fifty congregations and a number of additional unorganized preaching places, the total number of lay members was not large. Accurate statistics are not available, the membership may have included approximately 1,100 families with perhaps 6,000 souls.[1] This number, however, represents an approximate doubling over a five-year period.[2] It has been noted that there were dissensions in many congregations and that schisms often occurred. In many cases members objected to the congregational constitution, particularly to such features as the catechumenate, church discipline, and the call of the pastor for an indefinite period.[3] The latter feature became established, but it has already been noted, that while synod did not relax discipline in principle, it came to be more cautious in handling it. The catechumenate died out gradually, and was already quietly being dropped at the end of the first decade.[4]

---

[1] Parochial reports for 1864 can be found in the I. S. D. for approximately two-thirds of the parishes. The numbers were obtained by adding their figures and increasing the total by one-half.

[2] Parochial reports for 1860 in the I. S. D. This seems to be the first year when they were generally collected, apparently in response to a request from S. Fritschel, who was then in Europe and requested the figures. A tabulation, K. M. 1861, 8, 55-56, gives about 540 families with about 3,200 souls.

[3] These specific points are named in the case of Clayton Center, when it was decided to abandon that congregation. Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Wartburg, March 24-28, 1859. Complaints in regard to the constitution are numerous.

A strict practice in regard to admission of members of secret societies required resignation from them before admission. This seems to have been followed generally, on the ground that such organizations had religious practices, and that to yield meant compromising with unionism. So stringent a practice, of course, stood in the way of numerical growth and sometimes offered grave impediments to the success of struggling missions.[5] Dancing was another point which was handled strictly. The emphasis on Christian living which was so characteristic of the synod induced it to condemn dancing as sinful. It was an erotic stimulant, with a tendency to promote delinquency with youth, and adultery with the older generation. Trouble was apt to arise when pastors did not content themselves with warnings, but exacted pledges and applied disciplinary procedure. At best, prospective members stayed away, and at worst, serious schisms resulted.[6]

---

[4] A letter, Stuermer - Grossmann, March 20, 1864, in I. S. D. asserts that the catechumenate was being ignored generally and had apparently come to be considered superfluous. The synod, as has been noted, was unwilling to revise the congregational constitution and thus was not ready to drop it. Stuermer's complaint, however, receives corroboration in the parochial reports, few of which report catechumens, although there are separate rubrics in them for families, voters, communicants and souls.

[5] This position is clearly and strongly stated in a paper presented at the convention of the synod in Madison in 1860, which was published K. B. III, 8, 57-59; 9, 65-68. It deals particularly with the Odd Fellows. When List arrived in Des Moines one of the most enthusiastic prospects was a German physician born in the Lutheran Church, who took List into his home and boarded him. He had promised a valuable lot for the contemplated church and generous support in other ways. The physician was an Odd Fellow who could see no harm in that organization, but was not deeply attached to it. However, he did not wish to withdraw for business and social reasons, particularly when List's objections caused a considerable local stir and provoked attacks in the press and even from the Lutheran General Synod. List wrote to Wartburg, and while the reply is not extant, it clearly was negative, with the result that the Odd Fellows were kept out and the congregation faced a long hard struggle for bare existence.

Pastors did not shrink from such consequences during the first few years. They were imbued with the ideal of select groups, distinguished by an emphasis on Christian living. It was better to have small groups in harmony with such ideals than large congregations which might be successful outwardly and prosperous, but which lacked zeal and were given to lax conduct. Indeed, when large groups were formed quickly, it was not uncommon for pastors to predict that a sifting would have to take place. They were keenly aware that many of the people with whom they dealt were unchurched and lacked spiritual depth. This did not lead them to the conclusion that an evangelical lenience was the first requirement in order to open the doors widely and bring large numbers under the influence of the church and the means of grace. Instead, it

---

See a letter, List - Grossmann, Fort Des Moines, June 18, 1859, in I. S. D. It has been noted elsewhere that synod was much interested in a group at Keosauqua first reported by Kessler. When a year later Himmler reported that most of the people were Odd Fellows, no further interest was shown.

[6] The official attitude is presented in an article by Deindoerfer, K. B., II, 8, 57-60. The case of Platteville has already been noted, where a strict attitude by the pastor on dancing was a factor in a schism which left only a struggling remnant of a strong congregation, which in the end had to be

created a fear of corrupting worldly influences, which must be kept outside through strict standards of admission, or removed, once they had gained entrance, through uncompromising discipline.[7]

In chapter V, the policy of the synod to adopt uniform pastoral practices has been discussed. Difficult cases kept cropping up, which give some measure of insight into the problems that constantly faced conscientious pastors. Should persons who did not know certainly whether or not they had been baptized, receive baptism, in order to receive certainty at the risk of repetition? Was an emergency baptism, performed by an excommunicate valid? Was confirmation an absolute requirement? Such questions came to the Ausschuss, which replied yes to the first two, and no the third. Such cases were not likely to affect members generally, but there were others that had broader implications. Could members be received if scandalous rumors which could not be proved were in circulation about them? Again, the Ausschuss replied yes, though it advised caution and postponement until investigation had taken place. What should be done with catechumens who failed to

---

abandoned. In the troubles which Klindworth experienced in Galena, the occasion seems to have been given by a case of two young girls from whom, at their confirmation, the pastor had exacted a pledge to shun worldly pleasures. One gave the pledge unwillingly. Both violated it by going to dances. The pastor placed them under discipline, found them unrepentant, and was ready to proceed to excommunication. Letter, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, April 10, 1860, in I. S. D.

[7] Deindoerfer gave expression to this prevalent attitude, K. M. 1861, 5, 37-9.

prove themselves? The reply was that they were to be carried as long as there was hope. When it vanished, they were to be dropped by public notice.[8]

One of the practices on which considerable emphasis was placed was the use of private confession. Zealous pastors upon whom their responsibility for their members weighed heavily, often met difficulty when they tried to insist on it. Objections were raised that this was return to Catholic practice and insistence might lead to defiance or withdrawal. Like the catechumenate, private confession soon lost ground, and before long in most congregations its use became optional and the option was rarely exercised.[9]

A part of the Neuendettelsau heritage of Iowa pastors was a love of liturgical form and dignity. They felt from the very beginning that the dignity of the services was neglected in American churches generally, and that influences stemming from them had corrupted the attitudes of American Lutherans. German Lutherans came from a variety of backgrounds, and some of them brought along strong prejudices where elaborate liturgical forms were concerned. The pastors therefore sought to develop an appreciation for liturgy, to introduce more elaborate forms and to induce the congregations to participate.[10] Their congregational constitution provided for the use of Loehe's Agende and their purpose was to introduce the full order of services which it contained. Sometimes such endeavors met resistance from members with deeply ingrained attitudes, and if the pastor ignored them or carried out his ideas with majority support, strife was apt to ensue and schisms were not unlikely. In the course of time, however, the synod established a policy of treading softly in this respect.[11]

---

[8] Chronik, 43, 44, 65. In regard to confirmation, it was held that instruction was unconditionally necessary, but the ceremony might be omitted if the congregation did not take offense; in cases of adults who would be embarrassed, a private ceremony was preferable. Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, April 28, 1862.

[9] A letter, Burk - Grossmann, Rush Creek, October 10, 1859, in I. S. D., gives emphasis on private confession as one of the causes of trouble there. S. Fritschel at one time had placed it in exclusive use in Platteville, K. M. 1856, 3, 22. By 1865, when the Parochialbericht had a rubric on this point, few of those extant in the I. S. D. mentioned private confession at all. In Platteville, however, some members still used it regularly. In Des Moines, a congregational regulation required it of those newly confirmed. Only Dubuque and Oregon, Ohio, mentioned it as optional, but little used, everywhere else only public confession was mentioned.

---

[10] S. Fritschel discussed liturgy at some length in a report on his missions in Wisconsin and Illinois in K. M. 1856, 3, 19-22. When he began, the services consisted of hymn singing, lessons, sermon and prayer. He introduced the confiteor, kyrie and creed. Congregational participation might have been secured if the liturgy could have been chanted, but lack of an organ made that too difficult. In minor services a beginning had been made in oral participation, but not in the main services. He had also introduced altar and pulpit. Gradually introduced, these things had been feasible, and they had improved the conduct of the members during the services. But people tended to be much more suspicious of liturgical innovations than of doctrine.

[11] At Rush Creek, the congregation consisted of South Germans, from Bavaria, who accepted liturgical elaboration and from Wuerttemberg, who rejected it. After a schism occurred, a compromise was reached under which two congregations were formed, each with its own practice. Letter, List - Grossmann, Rush Creek, October 11, 1858, in I. S. D.; Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, January 8-9; March 19-20; April 20, 1861.

Disciplinary procedure has been discussed in chapter V and the fact noted that by the end of the decade a realization was growing that the ideal of the small select group was untenable, and that a more moderate policy was needed. It should be noted that strict discipline by the pastor was also apt to lead to withdrawals not only of those disciplined but of relatives and friends.[12] Furthermore, discipline raised problems concerning the permissibility of association with those under excommunication to which reference also has been made. Clearly the early strict practice in these respects militated against rapid growth. Whether the emphasis on brotherly discipline among members also operated in this way is difficult to tell.

Letters, Dietz - Grossmann, January 12; October 12, 1858, in I. S. D. indicate that even in Dubuque there were strong objections to kneeling at prayer and to joining in common prayer with the pastor, because visitors considered such practices Catholic. At Jonesboro people of Austrian background found the forms of Loehe's Agende Catholic, and concessions were made after a schism had occurred. A group of Palatines then demanded other changes in the communion liturgy, to which the pastor could not agree, and a second schism resulted. Letters, Joseph Mayer - Ministerium, Jonesboro, May 10, 1861; Schieferdecker - Grossmann, November 19, 1861; Heckel - Grossmann, April 22, 1862; July 1, 1863; February 24, 1864, in I. S. D. The instruction to young pastors by Deindoerfer in 1862, advised them to exercise care in this respect.

[12] Deindoerfer presented a case to the Ausschuss, involving the wife of an excommunicate. She no longer attended and did not respond to invitations to visit the pastor for admonition while the attitude of the husband made it inadvisable for the pastor to visit her. What could be done? A ministerial conference replied that the pastor should inquire in writing whether she considered herself as having withdrawn from membership. If the reply were negative the degrees of admonition were to be applied in writing. Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Wartburg, November 2-4, 1857.

Pastors found it difficult to achieve much in this respect and felt that a sore point existed in lack of such practice among members. Obviously, however, tactless procedure in so delicate a matter was capable of producing friction and strife, and may well have been a factor in the schisms.[13]

If high ideals and strict practice stood in the way of rapid expansion, the grave physical difficulties confronting the missionary pastors should not be overlooked as additional handicaps. Travel was difficult at best in rural regions, and few of the pastors possessed means for acquiring conveyances. When missionary trips were undertaken, the Reiseprediger travelled on foot. They usually hoped to obtain lodgings and meals from those whom they might interest in their cause. If their inquiries proved barren day after day, their funds were quickly exhausted and their only means of replenishing them consisted of small fees which might be obtained for baptisms and other ministerial acts and of offerings which might be lifted if they succeeded in finding larger groups.[14] Adverse weather conditions, swollen creeks, pathless forests or prairies in which they might lose their way in daylight and particularly as night fell, were additional handicaps which might seriously endanger health and safety.[15] The individual pastor usually had a farflung parish, because people lived in small scattered groups. His residence was usually in the strongest congregation and he served _Filialen_ and preaching places in various directions up to twenty miles or even more away. It was a rare Sunday when he had services in only one place, and often some of the _Filialen_ were served on weekdays. Nearly all of them had to do this traveling on foot in all seasons and in all kinds of weather.[16] It was difficult to maintain regularity and to do intensive work when conditions were so adverse.[17]

---

[13] In 1865 and the following years the Parochialberichte in I. S. D. contain reports on such matters. Of eighteen statements in regard to the practice of brotherly discipline, three stated there was none; one, almost none; one, very little; three, little; four, a few; three, some; three, yes. Of the last three, one was unqualified, one said yes, good (Dubuque) and one yes, legalistic.

[14] The various cited accounts of the Reiseprediger illustrate the difficulties. When Kessler and Hempeler, e. g., took their trip of some weeks, they were given $10 for expenses. Kessler had $8 of his own in addition. He mentions the means of replenishment, K. M. 1860, 8, 9 and 10, 60.

---

[15] _Ibid._, 77, 78. The accounts describe numerous incidents. When S. Fritschel made his first exploratory trip into Wisconsin in January 1855, he was drenched and then nearly crushed by drifting ice while crossing the river at the very start. Later he ran into sleet and then heavy rains and was soaked to the skin. It was necessary to wade through creeks and he repeatedly lost his way. The trip lasted a week, he returned penniless and had failed to find any kind of opening. He was ill for another week afterward, _K. M._ 1855, 6, 45; 8, 62.

[16] When Bredow was stationed at Oxford, Wisconsin, he had to start on foot in a driving rain one Saturday on a trip of twenty-four miles. He lost his way and barely found quarters late at night. He was ill for two weeks, _Erinnerungen_, 17-19. When S. Fritschel was stationed in Platteville he held services there on one Sunday. The next Thursday he went to Hazel Green for an evening service. Friday he went on to Menominee for another. Saturday he went to Rush Creek for a Sunday service there, _K. M._ 1856, 1 and 2, 14.

[17] A letter, Brueckner - Grossmann, Spring Creek, August 24, 1861, reports that his plan was to serve his farthest outpost at Fairbank on one Sunday and to have services both in Independence and at Spring Creek the next. Recently he had

Where intensive work was possible it was done, however. In 1855, S. Fritschel at Platteville devoted one week at that charge and the next to other places. In Platteville, there were services Sunday morning, afternoon and evening. Besides this there were weekday services on Wednesday and Friday evenings.[18] Such a program could not always be carried, but it was customary to devote Sunday afternoon to Christenlehre, or if that was not possible to have it before or after the morning service. One weekday service, often more informal, held in different homes and consisting of Bible study, was also maintained where possible, and sometimes held every two weeks or once a month, if it was not possible to have it every week. By the end of the decade, however, the weekday services were being abandoned and attendance at Christenlehre was declining.[19]

---

had to drop Spring Creek altogether, because rain delayed him at Independence, and he lost his way later and did not reach his home at all that night.

[18] K. M. 1856, 3, 23. The character of the services differed. Sunday afternoon was Christenlehre, catechetical instruction in which the entire congregation participated. Sunday and Friday evening Bible classes were held. On Wednesdays Fritschel explained the Augustana except during Lent.

[19] The parochial reports for 1865 in I. S. D. indicate that five parishes of nineteen reporting regularly had weekday services, although the intervals are not stated. A sixth had them in winter. The others report none, or lenten services or make no report on this account at all. Attendance generally drew complaints or such remarks as by those nearby only. On the other hand, fifteen reports indicated that Christenlehre was held. Of those specifying the time, four gave Sunday afternoon, one before the service, and three after the service.

Christenlehre took the place of a Sunday School which in its present form was not in use. Parochial school, however, was strongly stressed. It has been noted that in Dubuque a school was organized before a congregation came into being. That pattern was often followed, for there often was demand for a school, where there was little interest in a church. The teacher could charge tuition, or sometimes he might take a public school and thus have a living. If he was a candidate or a pastor, he would try to reach parents through the children. It might happen too that groups which seemed anxious for a church in reality were interested primarily in a teacher for their children.[20] The interest of the pastor in a school, however, did not slacken once a church was established. He was usually busy throughout the week in the school, and if he had Filialen, parents would be encouraged to send their children to the school in the main congregation or efforts would be made to provide a period of instruction in the Filialen. This problem often weighed heavily on the pastor.

Those who had it on Sunday mornings all reported good attendance and so did two of those who held it on Sunday afternoon. The rest complained of poor attendance or indicated that only children went.

[20] The case of Schorr at McGregor which has been noted in the preceding chapter, seems to have been of that kind. Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, March 26, 1862, mention specifically that a man to teach, apparently in a public school, was desired. In Paducah too a school may have been in greater demand than a church, Ibid., February 15; April 22, 1864.

While the schools were maintained primarily for the religious instruction they offered, they also served the purpose of maintaining the German language. Since Synod strongly upheld this aim, its schools were considered a means to that end, and this purpose was given considerable stress.[21] The maintenance of discipline and the inculcation of standards of seemly behavior were also emphasized and the parochial schools were contrasted in this respect to district schools.[22] They did not, however, neglect general elementary education and instruction was usually offered in arithmetic, geography and singing. Some schools began to teach English also, perhaps to meet the competition of district schools.[23] The school hours usually occupied forenoon as well as afternoon periods and vacations were usually given only during the season of pressing work, in the summer.[24]

---

[21] Deindoerfer wrote a long article on parochial schools in 1864 which was published K. B. VII, 12. He strongly stressed the necessity of maintaining German if Lutheranism was to survive in America, 92.

[22] Ibid., 92-93. Deindoerfer had a very poor opinion of public schools on this account, and because of low standards of achievement. A report sent to Germany by an outsider expressed similar opinions and opposed the introduction of English into parochial schools as well, Freimund, 1859, 11, 135.

[23] Deindoerfer was in harmony with this and wished that it might be done generally. Loc. cit., 93. There was pressure for the opposite policy too. A letter, Hoerlein - Grossmann, Elkport, December 24, 1861, in I. S. D. reported that the State Board of Education in Iowa, on request of the governor, had decided to make German a regular subject of instruction in the public schools.

The members did not always appreciate the schools despite all the efforts which the pastor put into them. Some preferred to send their children to public schools, others did not send them to school at all, or only irregularly, often maintaining that they were needed at home. Doubtless bad roads and long distances were also discouraging factors. On the other hand, non-members often sent children, and there were instances in which such pupils outnumbered those which came from the congregation.[25] The synod, however, continued to stress the schools strongly, and most pastors carried a heavy burden, about which they frequently complained. Teachers were few, largely because few parishes were strong enough to carry them, but by the end of the decade some thought was being given to reestablishing a teachers' seminary.[26]

---

[24] An example was reported in a Visitationsbericht for Portage and Lewistown, Wisconsin, September 4, 1860, in I. S. D. This school also taught English. Various Parochialberichte report similar arrangements. Sometimes the pastor taught only four days a week, however, to save time for study or Filialen. An example is reported in a letter, Schieferdecker - Grossmann, Altenburg, March 18, 1862. His daily hours, however, ran 8:00-5:00, an hour longer at each end than usual. Deindoerfer, loc. cit., 91, refers to vacations and suggests that in rural schools, if the school continued through the summer, it need not be taught the entire day. The later Parochialbericht indicate, however, that half days of teaching were becoming common.

[25] The Parochialberichte give attendance statistics. In Dubuque, there were regularly more children of non-members than of members. Deindoerfer's cited article also deals with non-attendance and decries excuses for it.

The older children received confirmation instruction from the pastor and thereafter did not attend the parochial school. The Christenlehre thereafter was to meet their further needs. Some attempts were made to establish societies for young men and young women separately, for adult women, or for special purposes, such as choral groups or missionary societies, but they were not in this period very successful.[27] In 1864 a suggestion was put forth for the establishment of congregational libraries. Members were to contribute regular dues from which the pastor might buy books for the library in Germany. The books then might be withdrawn and read aloud in the family circle on long winter evenings, while the individual members were engaged in their various tasks. If a variety of good books were available, this should prove both entertaining and instructive and it might counteract pernicious reading material which children were apt to pick up otherwise.[28] There is no evidence that this plan was widely adopted.

---

[26] K. B. VII, 12, 89. Deindoerfer in the same article reports that the convention of 1864 decided in favor of establishing one when it should become possible, and named a school committee to deal with the matter.

[27] The Parochialberichte for 1865 report a choral group and a women's society at Des Moines, and a choral society at Oregon, Ohio. Two others reported attempts to establish societies, which failed.

The pastors were hard-working men, who lived often in great isolation and under primitive conditions. They travelled a great deal, usually on foot and under difficult conditions, had a variety of exacting duties and held ideals which involved burdensome personal responsibilities. Distracted frequently by quarrels and meeting much opposition, their material rewards were not large. Their policies and those of the synod tended to keep numbers small and their people commonly were poor and struggling beginners. Even when this was not true, they came from an environment in which established state churches were the rule, and they had had little opportunity to develop a sense of responsibility for the decent maintenance of their clergy. Often too, they came from a background of crushing poverty and carried over traits of petty parsimony, if not downright avarice. Penuriousness rather than liberality seems to have been the rule.[29] Living on a low cultural level themselves, they had neither sympathy nor understanding in many instances for the real needs of their pastors.

---

[28] The plan was published K. B. VII, 4, 29-30. Suggestions for books included stories for children, biographies of church leaders, books on nature and science, on travel, on church and profane history and missionary literature. The president's report to the convention of 1864 endorsed such libraries for the confirmed youth. Synodalbericht 1864, 8.

[29] The parochial reports of 1865 contained a rubric for listing the chief sins with which pastors had to contend. Of twelve replies, five listed avarice and four indifference, one of the four giving both. Other answers were contentiousness and worldly pleasures.

Few of the pastors had means of their own. Those who came from Neuendettelsau were outfitted with clothing by the *Gesellschaft*[30] and there is some evidence that the seminary also tried to do this.[31] The synod was not at that time able to pay salaries to missionaries setting out to establish new charges or even to its *Reiseprediger*. Such men, therefore, depended on voluntary maintenance, offerings for their support, casual perquisites for ministerial acts and on tuition from school children, until they could organize congregations and draw salaries. When salaries were stipulated they were usually meager. In 1860 there were only two pastors in the entire synod whose salaries exceeded $200 annually.[32] There were pastors at that time who received incomes ranging from $70 to

---

[30] The earliest description of the items furnished is in *Freimund*, 1868, 26, 219. It lists: twelve shirts, twelve cotton and six woolen sox, six white and six colored handkerchiefs, six undershirts, two pairs of drawers, six white neckties, three clerical ties (*Baeffchen*), one bedspread, pillow cases and sheets, a straw mattress, and two straw quilts. Presumably the candidates or their families were responsible for other items and for a clerical robe. Women's and girls' societies were asked to contribute such items as those listed. *K. M. N. F.* I, 2, 12.

[31] *Rechnungsabschluss* in I. S. D. lists such items as boots for one student and a clerical robe for another. S. Fritschel's *Bericht* to Deindoerfer mentions gifts from Russia for equipping seminary students.

[32] *Ibid*. They were Doerfler in Toledo and Schieferdecker in Altenburg.

$100 annually. The calls issued often did not stipulate specific amounts at all, but merely promised support in general terms. The synod came to realize that it had been at fault in accepting such arrangements, and that doing so encouraged congregations to contribute only a bare minimum.[33]

At the convention in 1861 this matter received attention. A paper presented there pointed out the scriptural duties of congregations and the obligations which meant special expenses to pastors. It decried dependence on casual perquisites and held that while pastors might in case of necessity do other work not out of keeping with their calling, they should ordinarily give all their time to their pastoral duties. In indigent congregations pastors might remain at a sacrifice; in those able to support them they were justified in leaving, if their support was not forthcoming adequately.[34] The synod accepted these principles and recommended a minimum salary of $200 to its congregations, noting that where it could not be raised the congregation should appreciate the sacrifices its pastor was bringing and pointing out that the synod might withdraw pastors even if the minimum were paid in cases where more could and should be done.[35] There are no statistics on the results of these measures but improvement does not seem to have been rapid.[36] In 1864 the synod resolved to raise the minimum to $250 in rural and $300 in urban congregations and to instruct the president to insist on these minima whenever new calls were issued.[37]

---

[33] Chronik, 51.

[34] The paper was by Schieferdecker and was printed K. B. IV, 11, 86-88; 12, 91. It held that the profession was too poorly paid in America and that often the worst offenders were able to do better.

Inflationary conditions resulting from the Civil War made the situation of pastors whose incomes were inadequate particularly precarious, and were probably responsible for the resolutions of 1864. The first statistics available date from 1865 and indicate that there had been some improvement, but that there still were parishes paying $150 or less.[38] It was customary to furnish a house for the pastor in addition to the salary, sometimes combining church and parsonage into one, but in small missions that was not always possible. Firewood was sometimes furnished or available on land belonging to the church. In rural congregations members often contributed provisions for the pastor's household, in addition to meager salaries. Perquisites for the performances of pastoral acts were also customary and the pastor might augment these by officiating outside of the congregation.[39] But at best the pastors were hard pressed and in many places their difficulties were increased by slowness and irregularity of payments.[40]

---

[35] K. B. IV, 12, 91-92 brought this statement with an appeal to each congregation to review its own case. Chronik, 52, reports that the synod accepted the views and principles of the Schieferdecker paper and that in the future no pastor was to be installed unless the call specified a definite sum. It also records that the recommended minimum included a residence in addition to the salary.

[36] Grossmann reported in 1864 that no instance had come to his attention where the resolution had had any effect, Synodalbericht 1864, 8. Pastor Schmidt reported in 1862 that Sauk could pay only $50. By serving several Filialen, he could earn more, but his health did not permit so much traveling on foot and he could not affort a horse. He asked for a transfer, letter, Schmidt - Grossmann, Sauk, August 4, 1862 in I. S. D. Pastor Himmler in 1863 requested a transfer from Prairie du Chien which paid $8 per month of which $5.50 went for rent and firewood, letter, Himmler - Grossmann, Prairie du Chien, January 21, 1863, in I. S. D. List's salary in 1863 had risen from $50-$60 to $70, although he had a house for which the congregation raised the rent and derived some income from a school. He suggested that he be transferred and Des Moines cared for as a Filiale until it grew stronger, letters, List - Grossmann, May 31, 1862; February 5, 1863, in I. S. D.

[37] List, Zusammenstellung 1864, in I. S. D. It was also resolved that pastors who were dependent on teaching should have a right to leave their charges if their situation were so precarious.

There was also no rapid progress toward the acquisition of church properties. In rural areas there were often gifts of land by consecrated members as building sites and for the use of the pastor. In the cities, the acquisition of lots often imposed heavy burdens. A few congregations already had properties when taken over by the synod,[41] but this was not generally true. During the decade, sixteen churches were built or acquired and in 1863 the total number of congregations possessing a church was nineteen.[42] It has been noted in chapter IV that in Dubuque the synod furnished most of the funds and that a heavy debt remained throughout the period. In chapter VI notice has been taken of appeals to Buffalo for Dubuque and Madison. In later years, appeals to other congregations in the synod were sometimes made through the Kirchen-Blatt, but the results were not impressive.[43] Appeals to the community were also made.[44] The churches were almost always frame structures and sometimes were simply houses acquired rather than built, to serve as church, parsonage and school. Only four of the churches had bells[45] and none had pipe organs, though melodeons were often used.[46] In the parishes which did not have churches, services were held in public buildings such as court houses and schools, and sometimes, particularly in Filialen, in the homes of members, rarely in churches of other congregations.

---

[38] The Parochialberichte in I. S. D. for 1865 have eighteen reports on salaries paid. Seven listed $250 or more up to $315. Dubuque listed $300 but gave the total income as $800, and five more listed $200-$237. Only one was below $100.

[39] The Parochialberichte in I. S. D. regularly had rubrics within and outside the congregations for baptisms, marriages and burials. In some instances the latter number exceeded the former, in Dubuque for 1865 in all three cases and the number was large, perhaps accounting in part for the large income reported in the preceding footnote.

[40] In the Parochialberichte for 1865 the statements on salary were accompanied by complaints on irregularity in four instances and by endorsement of regularity in only two.

---

[41] Chronik, 16, provides these data through 1863. It lists Toledo, Mount Clemens and Cottage Grove as already having churches.

[42] Ibid. Churches were built in Dubuque, St. Sebald, Maxfield, Madison, Platteville, Germanville, Tete des Morts, Oregon, Newport, Ida, Prairie du Chien, McGregor, Jonesboro, Galena, Elkport, West Union. It is possible that a few more may have been built in 1864. Des Moines was building in that year, letters, Lutz - Grossmann, Des Moines, March 28; August 8, 1864, in I. S. D. Dubuque was still using the addition to the seminary building.

[43] Galena appealed for aid on a down payment of $300 in 1860, K. B. III, 10, 80. Klindworth receipted $27.25, Ibid., IV, 7, 56. Platteville asked for aid, noting that $200 of indebtedness had been incurred, IV, 9, 72 and receipted $11.82, V, 4, 32. Prairie du Chien asked for small gifts V, 6, 48 and receipted $8.13, V, 10, 80. Germanville in asking aid promised future responses to appeals from elsewhere VI, 2, 13 and receipted $7.35, VI, 40. In some cases additional small amounts were receipted later. Dubuque is the only congregation listed as responding to every appeal and provided the bulk of the aid.

[44] In Des Moines the community was systematically canvassed and more than $1,000 was raised, cited letter, Lutz - Grossmann, March 28, 1864. Additional aid was requested through the K. B.

The financial system of the synod will be discussed later, but it should be noted that offerings were expected from the congregations for synodical purposes, chiefly maintenance of the seminary and the Indian Mission. In the absence of adequate financial records,[47] no clear picture of the support given to synodical enterprises can be drawn. Offerings were lifted, but there was complaint of much irregularity. The amounts raised were small and not nearly adequate for either purpose, let alone for both. Clearly the congregations were unable to carry the burden. Neither do they generally seem to have a deep conviction of the necessity of the causes supported and a resulting determination to bring burdensome sacrifices for their maintenance.[48]

---

[45] Chronik, 71, Dubuque, Toledo, Cottage Grove and Maxfield had bells.

[46] Ibid.

[47] The books of the various treasuries are not extant for the first twenty-five years. Receipts are listed in the K. B. but there was much complaint about errors and omissions. The Parochialberichte for 1865 list the total offerings raised for that year, but besides covering less than half of the parishes do not always distinguish between local and general purposes.

The Civil War indirectly, through the general increase of the cost of living, made the work of the last years of the period more difficult. Direct effects are not often mentioned. Since the exchange value of the dollar declined greatly, the payment of the debts in Germany became much more burdensome, but the assumption of the debt by the Gesellschaft offered relief. On the other hand, the contributions sent from Germany appreciated in proportion to the depreciation of the dollar. Pastors were not exempt from the Civil War conscription, but only one pastor of the Synod was drafted, and he was able to furnish a substitute, though he had to appeal for aid to the congregations, which in this case was generously given.[49] The only congregations in territory disturbed by the war were those in Missouri. Altenburg had repeated scares, but was chiefly inconvenienced by disrupted communications. Jackson suffered severely from guerrilla warfare. At one time Pastor Doederlein and several of his members were carried off, after looting bands had ravaged the vicinity. Doederlein escaped, but several of his members were shot.[50] The synod as such took little official notice of the war, although it recommended a special prayer to its congregations at the convention of 1861.[51]

---

[48] As early as 1855, S. Fritschel while praising the readiness of the people at Platteville to contribute for congregational purposes and for local charity, noted that it was extremely difficult to interest them in the seminary, K. M. 1856, 1 and 2, 16. Platteville was in the immediate vicinity and its pastor was thoroughly devoted to the cause. It can be understood that hard-pressed pastors at a great distance would find it even more difficult to stimulate such an interest.

[49] The pastor was Oetjens at Ida, Michigan, who was drafted in 1864. A letter, Oetjens - Grossmann, Ida, 1865, in I. S. D., reports that a substitute cost him $200 and that he was in debt at heavy interest for the greater part of this sum. His congregation could help no further and asked that an appeal be made to synod. Grossmann published and endorsed the appeal and enough came in to pay the debt, K. B. VIII, 6, 48; 10, 80; 12, 88. Oetjens seems to have had premonition for in a letter, Oetjens - Grossmann, Ida, April 11, 1863, in I. S. D. he had noted that the draft was about to begin and that pastors were subject to it. He found this highly objectionable and inquired whether pastors should refuse to serve if drawn, or merely protest. In Buffalo circles a movement

The constitution provided by the synod had little to say on congregational organization. There is not much information extant, although references to congregational meetings

---

existed for offering passive resistance. Congregation members were, of course, conscripted in various places. According to a letter, Ide - Grossmann, Marine City, February 27, 1865, in I. S. D., the congregation at Port Huron had to remain a *Filiale* because the draft had taken members or imposed heavy burden through payments for substitutes.

[50] Letter, Doederlein - Grossmann, Jackson, October 28, 1861, in I. S. D. Several letters of Schieferdecker mention scares or difficulties of communicating with the congregations in Illinois, or interruptions of mail service. See also *K. M.* 1863, 3, 22-3.

[51] Dr. Fikenscher in 1861 suggested a special number of the *Kirchenblatt* for publication of Lincoln's proclamation of a national day of repentance and prayer. He made the suggestion that a suitable prayer be provided for use in the regular services, letter, Fikenscher - Grossmann, August 27, 1861, in I. S. D. The recommendation is in *Synodalbericht 1861*, 39. *Tagebuch von H. F. Dietz* indicates that this pastor regularly observed days of prayer and penitence proclaimed by Abraham Lincoln during the war years.

occur frequently. They gave voice and vote to adult males, who were full members. A vestry was chosen, whose members were often also trustees. The meeting dealt with the business affairs of the congregation, church buildings and repairs, salary, reception of members, and might designate offerings for charitable purposes or deal with cases of discipline. The vestrymen were to assist the pastor on disciplinary matters and in the supervision of catechumens, as well as act as an executive committee in business matters. The pastor seems usually to have been the chairman and in meetings, when a call was to be issued, it was the practice to have a clergyman present.[52]

The synod was interested from the beginning in maintaining supervision over pastors and congregations and to that end provided for visitations to be conducted by the president or a deputy. Originally they were to be held annually, but this was soon changed to every two years.[53] The order originally adopted provided for a sermon by the visitor in the chief service, suited to the occasion. The visitor held a consultation with the pastor to learn whether there were complaints on his part or whether he had wishes and desires which needed public discussion. Then a consultation was held with the vestry from whom the visitor inquired whether there was anything about the pastor or his family which interfered with a proper relationship to the congregation and whether the pastor was given adequate support. In a joint meeting with pastor and vestry the visitor inquired about Christian conduct in the congregation and its individual families. A congregational meeting followed in which members were asked whether the pastor preached pure doctrine, administered the sacraments properly and was faithful in instruction and discipline and whether he and his family provided a good example of Christian conduct at all times. The visitor then addressed the meeting and dealt with all the complaints and wishes that had been voiced. If necessary he also dealt with the pastor privately.[54]

---

[52] *Protokoll der am 30 Mai 1855 in Dubuque gehaltenen ev. luth. Gemeindeversammlung*, in I. S. D. offers an example of a meeting conducted by Grossmann himself. A vestry was chosen. A regular offering was fixed for every Sunday, the proceeds to go to local charity, and which could be diverted only by special resolution. Once a month an offering was to be taken for the church building fund. Perquisites were to be left to individuals as were contributions for the salary. The vestry was made responsible for new members, who were to be chosen on spiritual rather than material grounds. A majority was to be a quorum. All members were, if possible, to attend funeral services. A letter, Schieferdecker - Grossmann, Altenburg, July 6, 1864, in I. S. D. raises the question of the chairmanship. Some members had objected to the pastor's presidency. No reply is recorded. Congregational meetings were often held quarterly.

---

[53] The provision for annual visitations is found in the first edition of the congregational constitution, Chronik, 8-10. The revised edition of 1860 contained the biennial provision, printed Gemeindeordnung. The first version had been adopted in 1855 at a pastoral conference in Dubuque of April 18-19, Chronik, 10.

[54] Protokoll der am Sonntag Judica zu Dubuque abgehaltenen Kirchenvisitation, in I. S. D. The order followed was from an old German regulation and may possibly have been supplied by Grabau, Deindoerfer Geschichte, 80. It is here described on basis of the procedure at Dubuque. Since

This order soon proved inadequate. In 1859 the ministerial conference adopted another at Galena.[55] Under it the pastor answered in writing a large number of questions concerned with number and kind of services, subjects of his preaching in them, attendance at conferences and performance of assigned tasks, subjects of private study, objections to Richtung of synod and the actions of the church government, time given to parochial school and books used in it, number of preaching places in the parish, congregational statistics, frequency of communion and average attendance, attendance at services, use of private confession, conduct of members toward pastor, each other, amount of annual contributions for seminary, number of readers of Kirchen-Blatt, and efforts to distribute good and Christian literature. The visitor was to ask the vestry about any and all complaints in the congregation and in regard to regularity of payment of the salary and to inspect the books. The questions submitted to the meeting were somewhat simplified and concerned the pastor's doctrine, his diligence in visiting the

---

Grossmann was the pastor, Deindoerfer conducted the visitation. It was held in 1856. There were no complaints, but Grossmann wished to have private confession stressed, which the visitor did at the end of the meeting.

[55] The visitation order is printed, Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 80-81. A few details are added in Zusammenstellung der in unserer Synode geltenden Verordnungen, in I. S. D. compiled also by Deindoerfer in 1862. Chronik, 30, notes the adoption at Galena. A pastoral conference in 1862 resolved to abolish the order of 1859, but did not replace it with another, nor is there any record of a third version before the end of the first decade. Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862.

sick and his conduct as well as that of his family. The answers of the vestry and the congregation were to be recorded and the visitor was to add his judgment.

The visitation clearly was intended to be a searching inquiry. The revised order obviously consisted primarily of an elaboration of the inquiries made from the pastor. From them it appears that the synod expected an accounting from him at regular intervals in regard to his endeavors to live up to the standards of his profession and the regulations of his church. He was thus to be kept under observation and in personal touch with the church government. An opportunity was afforded to him for personal consultation, in which problems, doubts, and disagreements might be given an airing. The congregation too was to be kept under observation and a check made on its loyalty, performance of obligations of membership and shortcomings, as well as to be given an opportunity to voice complaints.

The efficiency of the system depended on the regularity of its administration. As the synod grew, the burden on its president increased. Grossmann found it impossible personally to carry out all the visitations. He enlisted the services of Deindoerfer and the professors at the seminary and of experienced pastors at a distance. By these means in the early sixties a conscientious effort was made to put the system into effect and a large measure of success was obtained. Grossmann himself travelled extensively in 1862, 1863, and

1864 and his assistants also conducted numerous visitations.[56] Occasionally a visitation served primarily as an investigation into a difficulty that had arisen, but most of them seem to have been made in regular order.[57] Results are difficult to estimate. The pastors were given good testimonials. Only private studies were a sore point. In 1864 Grossmann gave them an eloquent admonition not to neglect their studies, which were essential for the sake of freshness and power in their preaching and suggested the formation of reading circles in connection with the conferences. Schools also drew criticism, but it was directed at the circumstances that made them inadequate rather than at the pastors. Less was said of congregations, though church attendance was praised and some sins like dancing reprimanded.[58] On efforts in regard to offerings and general support of the synod nothing was reported.

---

[56] Grossmann made an extensive tour of southern and central Iowa in 1862, on which he reported in Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, August 14, 1862. See also a report by Hoerlein who accompanied Grossmann on this trip of some 500 miles by buggy in K. M. 1862, 11, 86; 12, 96. In the same year Deindoerfer and G. Fritschel visited all the Wisconsin Conference parishes, Ausschuss Minutes, September 29, 1862. S. Fritschel in the same year visited the Toledo Conference and some congregations of the Galena Conference. This left a number of congregations in Iowa and most of those in the Altenburg area unvisited, probably because Grossmann in 1861 had been able to conduct only one visitation because of illness, although Schieferdecker conducted at least one in his area. In the next two-year period Grossmann visited the southern area in 1863 and together with Deindoerfer, the Wisconsin and Toledo Conferences in 1864 and had the Dubuque Conference scheduled for later in that year. Thus in that period only the southern Iowa group went unvisited, unless someone else was assigned to do so before the end of the year. The data are from Grossmann's report Synodalbericht 1861, 26; 1864, 36. A schedule for a visitation in the Toledo Conference planned for Grossmann, but actually carried out by S. Fritschel is contained in a letter, Doerfler - Grossmann, Toledo, July 3, 1862, in I. S. D. Besides carrying on visitations he was to take part in a church dedication and in that of the Toledo orphanage and to participate in the organization of a congregation.

[57] Schieferdecker visited Jonesboro, Illinois, in 1861, when there was difficulty there between pastor and congregation over liturgy. He reported, however, that he had not known of the trouble beforehand. It may be that he had been asked to conduct the visitation on the assumption that he was aware of it, or that he meant that he did not know of it, before the instruction reached him, letter, Schieferdecker - Grossmann, Altenburg, November 19, 1861, in I. S. D. The report is entirely concerned with the difficulty and its adjustment. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Waucoma, August 23, 1861, in I. S. D. requests a visitation for the purpose of regulating the writer's salary, in regard to which apparently his recent call to that charge had made no provision.

Congregations were expected to assume membership in the synod and to send delegates to its conventions. Since the synod, however, required adoption of its constitution for congregations, or if they already had constitutions, their amendment so as to include all essential features of the former, there were obstacles sometimes. The synod permitted its pastors to serve congregations in such cases, in the expectation that changes would be made. It also was willing to give pastors to vacant congregations from other synods, which it could not immediately accept into membership.[59] Thus non-synodical congregations came to exist. The privilege of sending delegates does not seem to have been valued highly. In

---

[58] There are few visitation reports extant for this period. The data are taken from Grossmann's presidential report to the convention of 1864, Synodalbericht 1864, 3-8.

[59] Chronik, 36.

1864 eight represented congregations, from seven parishes constituted the largest lay delegation of the decade.[60] Only St. Sebald had been represented at every convention since 1855, though Dubuque had missed only once.

---

[60] Synodalbericht 1864, 2.

CHAPTER IX

EXTENSION: THE INDIAN MISSION

The Iowa Synod found its major sphere of activity in missionary work among unchurched German immigrants of Lutheran confession. It also tried for some years to maintain a foreign mission among the Indians of North America. Loehe, as has been related, had organized an Indian Mission in Michigan which had been taken over by the Missouri Synod. The break between Loehe and that synod also severed the connections between the Gesellschaft and the mission in Michigan. Since, however, some means were available for the purpose and since there continued to be a supply of men who wished to devote themselves to Indian missions, it was hoped that a new start could be made through the Iowa Synod. Deindoerfer on his exploration trip to Iowa in 1853 among other things made inquiries about the location of Indians who might be reached from the new location, and reported favorably.[1] He went so far as to suggest the organization of a mission school in connection with the seminary, where men trained in Germany might be instructed in Indian languages.[2]

---

[1] He saw a Dutch Reformed pastor in Dubuque who told him that Indians were numerous in the immediate vicinity of St. Paul, Minnesota, which was easily and cheaply accessible by steamboat from Dubuque. There were also many Indians in northwestern Iowa, but they were being removed from there while they were being moved into Minnesota, K. M. 1854, 2, 12.

[2] Ibid., 3, 23, 24. In a summary of the advantages of the location near Dubuque Deindoerfer praised it as the best

Among the men who arrived in 1854 and who, with Deindoerfer and Grossmann, formed the Iowa Synod was Candidate M. Schueller, who wished to work among the Indians. S. Fritschel, designated for the seminary, was interested in Deindoerfer's plan for the instruction of missionaries, and volunteered to accompany a missionary for a year, so that he might learn the language of the tribe selected, and then, returning to the seminary might give the linguistic instruction.[3] Great difficulties, however, stood in the way of these projects. The new synod obviously was not in a position to support them and the Gesellschaft too, though it trained men for foreign mission work and received contributions for it, was not itself at that time engaged in it and had no large regular income for the purpose.[4] Schueller was therefore assigned to Garnavillo and

---

possible starting point. The Mississippi would soon be reached by railroads then building and extensions far out into Indian territory were projected. Meanwhile river connections to Minnesota were available. The report makes it appear that he had been instructed to make inquiries about Indians in Minnesota. The editor in a footnote promised fuller information, Ibid., 2, 12. A long account appeared in 1855 in installments in 3-9, consisting chiefly of a translation of an undated report of the U. S. Superintendent for Indian Affairs and describing location and conditions of the various tribes throughout the country.

[3] Ibid., 1855, 3, 24. The introduction to the report on American Indians just cited gives this information, noting a request of Fritschel for a year's leave for the purpose and expressing mild doubts whether a year would suffice, but considering it possible in view of Fritschel's talent for languages. No letter of Fritschel on the subject is extant, but several letters of his brother in the Fritschel Family Correspondence sound as if he considered a missionary career himself, and express an ardent desire to join him in it.

[4] K. M. 1855, 3, 24.

although he at first considered this a temporary expedient, he accepted a call in 1855 and thus took up regular pastoral duties. If he still entertained hopes that he might later take up work among the Indians, they were never destined to be fulfilled.[5] In the same year a ministerial conference discussed the Indian mission project, but regretfully came to the decision that because of the lack of means, there was no present prospect that it could soon be realized.[6]

This decision was clearly influenced by cautious German replies to inquiries in regard to support and Fritschel's project. The resources of the Gesellschaft were then strained by endeavors to raise the money for the purchase of the seminary building and endeavors were being made to contact other groups for support of the mission.[7] The synod was also informed that while efforts would be made to give support, the mission would have to be a synodical project, directed in America.[8] The German fathers were no more willing to assume control over a mission project, than they were to direct the synod itself. The synod which was in the midst of a trying adjustment to an independence which its members had thought premature could hardly give serious consideration to so difficult an undertaking without assurance of adequate material support.

---

[5] In a report printed Ibid., 5, 41-43, Schueller described his work, but the passage dealing with his plans is not clear. It seems that he wished to be replaced, so that he could proceed with his plans. In 11, 90, Grossmann reported that Schueller had accepted a call to Garnavillo after long hesitation; he had not wished to abandon the purpose of going to the Indians.

[6] Chronik, 12. This was the regular ministerial conference which met at St. Sebald, November 21-22, 1855.

[7] Letter, Bauer - S. Fritschel, Neuendettelsau, May 29, 1855, in I. S. D. Bauer wrote that some $200 were available for the mission, but that efforts, not yet successful, were being made to secure aid from the Central-Ausschuss des evangelisch-lutherischen Missions-Vereins fuer Bayern in Nuernberg. This organization is usually called the Centralverein in the correspondence and that term will be used hereafter. The letters of G. Fritschel to S. Fritschel in 1855 and 1856 in the Fritschel Family Correspondence, indicate that aid was granted and express confidence that an Indian Mission would have a popular appeal in Germany and draw the required support.

Before the year was over, however, more optimistic reports were coming from Germany. A missionary was available and would be sent in the spring, a fairly substantial sum was at hand, German groups favored the undertaking and promised to support it. If a successful start could be made and regular reports sent, these promises would be fulfilled. The suggestion was made that prospects might be much better in Canada than in the United States, because there were fewer Indian disturbances there. Direction must be in the hands of the synod, but it was encouraged to make a start and to send S. Fritschel out with the new missionary.[9] The suggestion that Canada offered while efforts would be made to give support, the mission would have to be a synodical project, directed in America.[8] The German fathers were no more willing to assume control over a mission project, than they were to direct the synod itself. The synod which was in the midst of a trying adjustment to an independence which its members had thought premature could hardly give serious consideration to so difficult an undertaking without assurance of adequate material support.

---

[8] Letter, Loehe - --, 1855, in I. S. D., a notation in English gives the date as September 11, 1855. Loehe was, however, hopeful that once begun the project would draw adequate support. He also suggested that the synod apply directly to the Centralverein.

[9] Letter, Bauer - S. Fritschel, Neuendettelsau, January 20-27, 1856, in I. S. D. Bauer also wrote that there would be no objection if the synod would make a connection with a society for foreign missions, though he does not name the Centralverein. He felt that prospects in the United States were unfavorable, because the Indians appeared to be facing extermination. Direction of a mission in Canada might be difficult, but that would be true in any case. The sending

Before the year was over, however, more optimistic reports were coming from Germany. A missionary was available and would be sent in the spring, a fairly substantial sum was at hand, German groups favored the undertaking and promised to support it. If a successful start could be made and regular reports sent, these promises would be fulfilled. The suggestion was made that prospects might be much better in Canada than in the United States, because there were fewer Indian disturbances there. Direction must be in the hands of the synod, but it was encouraged to make a start and to send S. Fritschel out with the new missionary.[9] The suggestion that Canada offered excellent prospects was also made from Buffalo circles, together with an indication that there was interest in an Indian mission in that synod also.[10] A ministerial conference in 1856 discussed these developments, took note of the impending arrival of a missionary and agreed to make a beginning.[11] The project was discussed at the Buffalo convention of 1856 which was attended by S. Fritschel and Grossmann and it was agreed to select the Canadian field. Information was to be sought from Canadian authorities and Fritschel together with the missionary J. J. Schmidt was to undertake an exploratory trip as soon as it was received, Buffalo promising to give aid to the mission.[12]

---

[8] Letter, Loehe - --, 1855, in I. S. D., a notation in English gives the date as September 11, 1855. Loehe was, however, hopeful that once begun the project would draw adequate support. He also suggested that the synod apply directly to the Centralverein.

[9] Letter, Bauer - S. Fritschel, Neuendettelsau, January 20-27, 1856, in I. S. D. Bauer also wrote that there would be no objection if the synod would make a connection with a society for foreign missions, though he does not name the Centralverein. He felt that prospects in the United States were unfavorable, because the Indians appeared to be facing extermination. Direction of a mission in Canada might be difficult, but that would be true in any case. The sending

---

of the missionary had been delayed by military complications, but a substitute had now been furnished and he was to come soon.

[10] Letter, Grabau - Grossmann, Buffalo, March 26, 1856, in I. S. D. The project had arisen during the negotiations over the call of S. Fritschel to Detroit. Grabau was not impressed with the idea of teaching the language in the seminary. There were too many languages; the best way was to send a man, supported by the mission, with his family to live among the Indians, learn the language and then secure the consent of the Indians to stay as missionary. Then helpers as needed might be broken in by him and all men would be replaced after ten years. He suggested a Canadian Indian Reserve between Lake Huron and Georgian Bay. Buffalo had been interested for years, but had lacked means to make a start. As to S. Fritschel, he should go only if he felt that he had a real call for this work.

[11] Chronik, 12. This occurred at the session of the western division of the ministerial conference, Dubuque, May 28, 1856, and required ratification by the synod or the ministerium.

[12] K. M. 1856, 4 and 5, 35-36. The information is in a letter, written by Schmidt, who was full of enthusiasm. An

Missionary Schmidt had arrived in June and spent part of the interval between his arrival and the convention of the synod in September assisting Pastor Schueller during an illness, because he hoped to learn English there, Schueller having married an American girl. The synod gave its approval and Schmidt and S. Fritschel were solemnly commissioned for their trip to Canada.[13] They left immediately afterward, stopping in Detroit, where Fritschel was installed, and visited a Moravian mission on the Thames in Ontario. Information gathered there induced them to go to Toronto to consult with Canadian officials. The visitors learned that their jurisdiction extended only over Ontario and that all the tribes under their jurisdiction already had missions, in the region of Lake Huron in which they were specifically interested, old and well established missions were in existence. When they inquired about

---

alternative mission in the west was dismissed as an impossibility, because of Indian disturbances and lack of means. The decision seems, however, to have been reached after the delegates to Buffalo had reported, rather than by the convention of the synod.

[13] Schmidt's report in *K. M.* 1856, 4 and 5, 33-39, tells about his assignment to Garnavillo. Schueller's wife spoke no German and he himself had learned enough English to deliver addresses in that language. Schmidt had also been offered an instructorship at the seminary, which he declined, because he wished to learn English. He was there four weeks and was not satisfied with his progress, *Ibid*., 10 and 11, 78. *Chronik*, 14, reports the commissioning at the convention in Dubuque on September 14.

Indians north of Lake Superior and westward from there, they were referred to the Hudson Bay Company with headquarters at Montreal. The travelers decided not to go there, but to try to get in touch with the company in writing through Buffalo intermediaries and returned to Detroit, both hoping that they might travel northward the next year. The season then was unfavorable, for the Indians had begun fall hunting and were roving from place to place.[14]

Schmidt substituted for Grossmann at the seminary during the ensuing winter, while Grossmann went to Europe. While there the latter sought to enlist aid from the Centralverein, seeing individual officers and putting in a formal request for support after a successful beginning should have been made. He noted the failure of the first attempt, but expressed confidence that a suitable field would be found.[15] No reply to this request is extant, and the request itself implies that Grossmann had met objections,[16] but support was later received from that source. The request in itself is the only official record of the synod's acquiescence in Schmidt's plan to continue his endeavors. Shortly after Grossmann's return in the spring of 1857 Schmidt began his second journey, accompanied by Student Sussner, who wished to become an assistant in the Indian mission.[17]

---

[14] There is a long account of the trip in K. M. 1856, 10, 11 and 12, 76-96. It consists of Schmidt's diary kept while traveling. They had stopped in Buffalo congregations in Wisconsin on the way to Detroit, where a small offering for the mission was given Schmidt. They had talked with Missouri pastors also, who were occupying the region north of St. Paul to which Deindoerfer had first called attention. Since their reception had been friendly, Schmidt considered spending the winter at the mission in Michigan to learn the language. He projected a trip northward in the following spring and specifically mentioned that Fritschel wished to go along again. He did not, however, and his direct connection with the mission ended with this trip.

[15] Document addressed, Vereherter Verwaltungsausschuss des koeniglich bayrischen Centralmissionsvereins, Neuendettelsau, January 19, 1857. It is not signed and is probably a copy although not so marked. It was clearly by Grossmann and the request is in the name of the Iowa Synod, which is said to feel that it had a special duty over against the Indians whose neighbor it was.

They traveled by boat from Detroit to Superior, and then bought a rowboat and amidst hardships and perils made their way along the shore to Grand Portage. It became clear at once that Catholic missions existed all along the lake shore and that the attitude of the missionaries was hostile.

---

[16] Ibid. Grossmann refers to objections by individual officers whom Grossmann had seen and who complained that aid given to the Gesellschaft for Indian missions had been used for other purposes. In reply he points out that aid was asked only after a mission should be in actual operation. He also notes that the Verein was supporting the Missouri mission in Michigan and that this might mean that it would have to judge right and wrong between the synods. Iowa, however, would not call for such a decision, because it did not consider the differences church-separating and would not refuse Missouri altar fellowship, even if Missouri should do so to Iowa.

[17] K. M. 1857, 9, 69-72, brings a report dated Superior, June 24, 1857, from Schmidt - G. Fritschel from which it appears that Sussner was with him and that one of the Hempelers who had had similar plans had either returned or given up the trip in order to enter the seminary, when Schmidt had to abandon plans to train him as missionary. The report subsequently cited indicates that Schmidt and Sussner left from Detroit on June 17.

Schmidt became acquainted with a Captain Kennedy, who had just returned from a scientific exploration into the interior and made inquiries from him about the Indians in the region of Lake Winnipeg and in the territories of the Hudson Bay Company, from whose governor he had secured a letter of introduction. The report was as unfavorable as possible. The Captain, who had himself spent some time in the service of the company, told Schmidt that his letter of introduction would help him little, for it was the policy of the officials on the spot to keep all strangers out and particularly to impede the endeavors of missionaries who threatened their system of exploitation. He related various examples and indicated that Catholic missionaries, who made few attempts to civilize the Indians, alone would be tolerated. Since the captain befriended Schmidt in various ways and seemed reliable, the latter abandoned all thought of going into company territory. The Indians of northern Minnesota seemed to offer the only other opportunity. Schmidt waited nearly two months for the arrival of a boat which was to bring an Indian Agent and annual supplies, in the hope of being enabled to make a connection with the Indians who would gather for that occasion. In the meantime he met some of them and tried to learn the language, but found progress slow. When the supplies finally came the agent gave him a chance to present his proposal, but the Indians refused to accept him on the ground that he did not know their language. He offered to learn it and to use an interpreter in the meantime, but to avail. Schmidt suspected that the local Catholic missionary had a hand in the refusal. He then thought of a journey inland to the westward, but the season was running late and his means were exhausted. All efforts having failed, he had no choice but to return and could do that only with great difficulty, since his funds were gone and repeated requests for replenishment had gone unanswered.[18]

The second failure did not discourage Schmidt. He returned to Wartburg in October 1857 and in the next month reported to a ministerial conference attended by all but two of the pastors. Letters from Germany indicated discouragement there, but the conference resolved to write back an exact account, giving assurance that Schmidt was by no means discouraged and asking for the fullest support possible.[19] The missionary was now planning a journey westward, to the territory between the Rocky Mountains and the Black Hills, to visit Crows and Blackfeet. He felt that the Indians were a doomed race, the white man encroaching on them from both the east and west. These tribes lived in a region as yet remote from population movements from either direction. They were not yet vitiated by contacts with the white race and a mission accompanied by colonization work might civilize them sufficiently so that they might be able to hold their own by the time that their territory too was reached by settlement.[20]

---

[18] The story of the journey is told at great length in K. M. 1858, 1 and 2, 3 and 4, 5 and 6, 1-36. They were forced to buy the rowboat, because they could not afford the high fare to the northern shore and also because connections were irregular. Neither of them having experience with boats, they took a young Russian guide, who offered his services in apparent sincerity at Superior and who had been a sailor as well as a woodsman. But after a few days, when storms had repeatedly endangered them along rocky shores, he deserted them. Schmidt liked the northern country and would gladly have stayed there. During the long wait he also sought to improve his English, but felt so inadequate that he presented his request to the agent in writing rather than orally. He closed with rather sharp complaints about the attitude of the German backers who wished to see results before giving liberal support, at a time when no beginning had yet been possible. Although sent as a missionary, up until then all the support he had received had been spent for his travels. In between them he had had to find other means of making a living. The editor in a postscript indicated that $400 a year was being raised for him, much for the donors, but little for a difficult beginning.

Schmidt spent the winter in Detroit[21] and while he was there the newspapers reported the arrival of Indian Agent

---

[19] Chronik, 19. The conference met November 2-4, immediately after the dedication of the seminary, to which all the pastors who could had come. The letters from Germany are not extant. Schmidt had returned October 3, having been gone four months, K. M. 1858, 5 and 6, 36.

[20] Ibid., 36-41, is a letter from Schmidt which expresses these ideas written from Detroit, December 9, 1857. He asserts that Blackfeet and Crows had always been his favorite tribes. In fact he had already so referred to them in his report of the previous year, when he thought that they lived in Canadian territory, beyond the tribes whom he was immediately considering for the journey of 1857, Ibid., 1856, 12, 95. Apparently it was their isolation and remoteness from the whites that drew him to them from a rational point of view, but he had also conceived a predilection for them. The 1858 account also mentions that he had at one time dreamed of working among the Apaches and other tribes in New Mexico.

[21] K. M. 1858, 5 and 6, 36, noted his intention to stay with or near the Michigan Indians. He may have been there part of the time. But in a letter, Schmidt - Deindoerfer, Detroit, March 10, 1858, in I. S. D. Schmidt wrote that S. Fritschel had been seriously ill and he had been substituting for him. The conference had advised him to spend the winter at the Michigan mission, Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Wartburg, November 2-4, 1859.

Redfield, whose district reached far out into the west up to the territories of the tribes in whom Schmidt was interested. Schmidt and Fritschel went to see Redfield, who showed interest, but emphasized the hardships which a missionary among the roving tribes of the far west would have to endure. When he learned that Schmidt was unmarried and that he was prepared for hardships, he expressed belief in the feasibility of Schmidt's project, encouraged him to undertake it, promised assistance and advice and told Schmidt that he was going out on a steamboat to the junction of the Missouri and Yellowstone and that Schmidt might go along, also giving him hopes for a reduction of fare.[22]

The synod had meanwhile established a mission committee, of which step Schmidt heartily approved, but with which, despite its request, he could not consult in person.[23] They approved of his arrangements, however, and selected Candidate

---

[22] This information is recorded in a letter, Schmidt - Loehe, St. Louis, May 20, 1858, published K. M. 1858, 7, 52-56. The fare to Fort Union at the junction was $75.00. He estimated that the Crows lived 400-500 miles farther up the Yellowstone. He had hoped to be able to go to both tribes, but had learned that they were bitter enemies and spoke different languages. He would have preferred the Blackfeet, but since transportation would be available to Crow territory he had decided that Providence directed him there.

[23] The cited letter, Schmidt - Deindoerfer explains that he could not leave Detroit, because of Fritschel's illness. The committee apparently had reprimanded him for not getting in touch with it for advice and instructions. He intended to attend the spring conference, however, but if he did so, he must have returned to Detroit, for he went to St. Louis from there. There is no record of the attendance at that conference, the minutes being written long afterward.

Braeuninger who had been preparing at the seminary for a missionary career as his companion. He was consecrated in May 1858 and sent at once to St. Louis. Schmidt had already gone there from Detroit and they left from there on the government boat Twilight with Redfield on May 23 on a journey that was to last half a year and cover some 5,000 miles.[24]

The Twilight took them to Fort Union at the confluence of the Yellowstone in a month. Delayed there for about two weeks, they were repelled and horrified by the conduct of white traders and the resulting vitiation of the Indians. They met a trader, Meldrum, who had a station, Fort Sarpy, in the territory of the Crows some 300 miles up the Yellowstone, received promise of his aid and clashed with him, but finally accompanied his expedition on a laborious voyage and went on even when Redfield had to abandon his visit to the Crows because of illness. They met their first Crows on the way and arrived at Fort Sarpy in mid-August. Their intention was to winter there but they could not stand the debauchery of the whites and the exploitation of the Indians. Meeting a friendly Crow chief, Dagbipashush, they joined his band and roamed with it for seven weeks through the valleys of the Little Big Horn and Powder rivers, from the Black Hills to the foothills of the Rocky Mountains. Their treatment at the hands of the Crows was friendly throughout, though they shared hardships and were horrified at some of the native customs. They liked the Crows, found them physically splendid specimens of manhood, noted that they as yet detested whiskey, and felt that they could be preserved from degeneration, if saved from vicious traders. The Crows were attentive, sought advice and tried to follow it. The missionaries compiled a vocabulary of some hundreds of words. Their hosts wished them to stay, and when the missionaries insisted on returning, invited them to come back and received their promise to do so with pleasure. An invitation had arrived from an Indian Agent, that the Crows were to come to Deer Creek in Wyoming about 100 miles from Fort Laramie, where peace was to be made between them and Arapahos and Cheyennes. They feared the Sioux and disliked going, but a band finally went, fearfully and cautiously, which the missionaries joined. They parted from the Crows there and joined the Agent, Twiss, returning on horseback over the Oregon Trail, and then by boat from Kansas City, arriving in St. Louis late in November.[25]

---

[24] Chronik, 21. K. M. 1858, 7, 53, gives the distance, St. Louis to Fort Union as 2,350 miles.

---

[25] The best report was published at Nuernberg in the *Missionsblatt*, running through the issues of 1859, beginning in 3. It consists of long sections of a detailed diary kept by the missionaries. *K. M.* 1859 has a brief preliminary sketch in 2 and 3 and there is also a brief report in *K. B.* I, 7, 12. Throughout the missionaries emphasize the vicious depravity of white traders and their vitiating influence on the Indians. Between themselves and the Crows a cordial relationship was established and while they were by no means blind to the vices of the Indians, they were clearly impressed with them and convinced that much could be done for them, if

The third attempt had thus finally yielded an open door for an Indian mission. If prospects were good, the difficulties were enormous. This was not an adjacent field, easily reached, such as Deindoerfer had suggested in 1853. Schmidt's plans too were ambitious. He suggested that the first step should be the establishment of a trading post by a Christian man of means, who should replace Meldrum and keep others of his ilk out, by dealing fairly with the Indians. The next should be the establishment of a colony in the valley of the Little Big Horn, consisting of a number of Christian young men, who would take up farming there, in order to influence the Indians to settle down and establish a secure livelihood. Only as this was gradually achieved could missionaries deal effectively with them. A process of civilization must precede that of Christianization.[26]

---

an immediate start were made. They dwell rather more on the hardships and hard work required by the voyage up the Yellowstone with Meldrum, than on the hardships and sufferings endured while traveling with the Indians. The latter placed three horses at the disposal of the Missionaries, one a pack horse, and shared tents and food with them, although there was a stretch of five days when they had to go hungry, because food was lacking. The vocabulary numbered 1,000-1,200 words. The missionaries strongly stressed the desire of the Crows that they return. According to the report in K. B. I, 7, the missionaries received free passage on the river boat.

[26] K. M. 1859, 2 and 3, 18-20. Schmidt inquired whether the fathers in Germany could suggest a properly qualified man of some means, who would be willing to become Indian agent. He added sanguinely that even with fair dealing there would be a profit. He felt that he and Braeuninger knew enough about Meldrum to procure his removal. No reply to this rather fantastic project is extant. The same lack of realism is evident in his further request for a number of young colonists, directly from Germany to establish the colony on the Little

Schmidt returned to Wartburg, where there was much rejoicing over the safety of the missionaries, from whom no word had come back since shortly after their departure. Plans were now made for carrying out his projects. Major Twiss, with whom he had returned, had promised to advocate the cause of the mission with the Office of Indian Affairs and Schmidt planned to consult Redfield again and secure his backing also.[27] An application was made to the government to secure the trade with the Crows or Upsarokas, and with the support of Agent Redfield a request was also made for government aid toward the establishment of an agricultural colony among them. The former was denied outright, the latter was also denied for the current year, but some hope was given that aid might be forthcoming later, after a successful beginning had been made. Another request, again supported by Redfield was then made for a license to establish an agricultural mission colony in Indian territory, which apparently was granted.[28]

Big Horn. There should be ten or twelve of them, they should be unmarried, but might establish families after two or three years. He strongly urged the interdependence of the two projects. The colony alone could not succeed, vicious traders would only prejudice the Indians against it. A trading post alone would not induce the Indians to settle down, which he thought a colony could readily accomplish. The Missionsblatt brought the same appeal, 1859, 3, 9-11.

[27] Ibid. Records of the mission committee, which must have given much consideration to these projects are not extant.

[28] Chronik, 27, reports the two former requests and their denial. A letter, Schmidt - M. Robinson, Superintendent of Indian Affairs, Detroit, May 16, 1859, in I. S. D. contains the request for the permit. The letter, written in German, is probably the draft, a translation of which was sent. It

Such an enterprise required much larger sums than had so far been available. The synod was not in a position to raise them and the Buffalo Synod had ceased by 1859 to give support. German sources doubtless had to furnish by far the greater portion of the costs. Although the burden was too heavy for the Gesellschaft, aid from the Centralverein had now been promised.[29] An expedition was equipped with wagons teams, provisions, supplies, tools and clothing at a cost of

---

takes notice of the earlier denial, but expresses the determination to go ahead. It refers to the declared policy of the government to favor such projects and reports that the application was first made to Redfield, who was willing to grant it, but could not, because the Crows were no longer under his jurisdiction. Redfield's endorsement is added, he expressed confidence in the missionaries. There is no record of Robinson's reply, but Chronik, 29, records that the expedition was not to leave until a permit had been secured and it did leave in July. A footnote by the editor in K. M. 1859, 9, 68, states that a permit was received.

[29] No financial records of the Indian Mission are extant and its financing is therefore untraceable. After Schmidt's trip to Lake Superior, the Gesellschaft found his financial requests staggering and almost beyond its means, letter, Lotze - Grossmann, Neuendettelsau, December 12, 1857, type copy in I. S. D. Schmidt mentioned heavy costs of his projects, but dismissed them rather airily, there was keen interest in the mission on both sides of the ocean and the Lord would provide. In this connection he mentioned that the Centralverein had sent a remittance and had promised more, but gave no amounts, K. M. 1859, 2 and 3, 19-20. Attempts to raise funds in America, however, were not neglected altogether. K. B. I, 10 and 11, reporting that the mission committee held its first session immediately after the convention of 1858, presented a request to all pastors and congregations to hold monthly mission services with offerings for the Indian mission. Doubtless to stir interest II, 1, 4-6, brought an article on Crow beliefs and legends and gave examples of the vocabulary, and 3, 22-24, another on war and fighting among the Indians.

over $1,400.[30] How this relatively large sum was raised is not clear, but there is evidence that it caused a good deal of difficulty.[31] As to personnel, Neuendettelsau had sent two missionaries, Kessler and Doederlein and two assistants, Krebs and Flachenecker, who had arrived in the spring. One assistant, Seyler, had volunteered from the seminary. In June Braeuninger, Doederlein and Kessler were ordained and the other three were consecrated as mission deacons.[32] In addition, four colonists had volunteered, Beck, Bunge, Feldman, and Meiser.[33] Lack of means, however, compelled a reduction in numbers to six so that Kessler was otherwise assigned and Krebs and Flachenecker remained at the seminary. They were to follow the next year.[34] Of the colonists only Beck and Bunge went along.

---

[30] A document in Grossmann's hand in I. S. D. lists these items with their cost in some detail. The totals run to $1,424, but the tools are not priced. According to Schmidt's Tagebuch in I. S. D. supplies were also bought enroute, but they may be included, since the list is not dated. The total costs probably ran well over $1,500. The list is printed in an article, The Iowa Synod's Attempt at Missionary Work among the Indians, 1859-64 by H. F. Staack, in Augustana Historical Society Publications, 2, 1932. It contains one discrepancy, in that it lists nine or ten oxen, whereas the first expedition used horses. Perhaps it was a preliminary estimate, rather than an accounting, because quantities on some other items also were stated alternatively. This would also explain the omission of the cost on the list of tools, etc.

[31] A letter, M. Loehe - Deindoerfer, S. and G. Fritschel, Fuerth, September 3, 1859, in I. S. D. makes it appear that a draft was drawn on the Gesellschaft, which could not be honored. Bauer seems to have written that money was available, but the Gesellschaft did not have it. The Centralausschuss did not have it either and refused to help on the ground that the enterprise should be kept within the means available. Loehe wrote that he believed that too, but could see that the original expedition would cause extraordinary expenses and that the Centralausschuss now had also come to that realization. He made no positive statement, but the tone of the letter indicates that some way of adjustment had been found.

[32] The personnel list and a detailed account of the consecration service are in K. M. 1859, 9, 67-72. The same account is in K. B. II, 7, 51-4, and 8, 61-2, describes farewell services and departure.

The missionary expedition left Wartburg July 3, 1859,[35] and travelled in its wagons via Des Moines, Council Bluffs, Columbus and Fort Laramie, to Deer Creek. At first it had much difficulty with bad roads, later the horses gave out and Schmidt was plagued with illness, which required medical attention. These circumstances forced a delay at Columbus, Nebraska, in August, where they met a Captain Gibson, who was acquainted with Agent Redfield, now in charge of the Yanktons, and who told them that Redfield wished missionaries for this tribe from the church which had in the preceding year sent men to the Crows. This they reported to Wartburg, before proceeding.[36] They lost a horse and a mule and had to trade the others for oxen, but finally reached Deer Creek, late in the season. To their disappointment, nothing further had been heard from the Crows there, since their visit of the preceding year. The intention had been to push on into Crow territory, but the advanced season made it inadvisable to do so. Major Twiss, the local Indian Agent, who had assisted the emissaries in the preceding year again was friendly. Their provisions were largely exhausted, but he promised them credit. The missionaries then decided that Schmidt and Doederlein should return to Iowa to bring out a new supply train, while Braeuninger and Seyler with the two colonists would remain at

---

[33] The names are given in Schmidt's cited letter to Robinson, May 16, 1859. Schmidt lists nine participants, these four Seyler, Flachenecker, Doederlein, Braeuninger, and himself. The first two colonists were included in the consecration ceremony described in the preceding footnote, as were Krebs and Kessler, who did not go at this time. It may be that the other colonists had withdrawn and that the intention at the time was to substitute Kessler and Krebs for them. The colonists came out of synodical circles, the German emissaries had only just arrived, in fact the ceremony had been postponed briefly because of delay in their arrival. It took place June 2, Chronik, 29; K. B. 8, 61, mentions colonist Feldmeyer who was to go the next year. Beck was from Dubuque and Bunge from New Baltimore, Michigan, Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Wartburg, March 24-28, 1859.

[34] Chronik, 29.

[35] The delay was caused by waiting for the permit which was being sought. See footnote 28.

---

[36] Tagebuch 1859, by J. J. Schmidt in I. S. D. It consists of letter sheets with entries at the more important stops and breaks off at Columbus. An account based on it appeared in K. M. 1860, 1 and 2, 6-9, and it is published in full in Missionsblatt, 1860, 3 and 5. Physicians permitted Schmidt to continue his travels, but put him on a diet. He seems to have suffered greatly from Des Moines to Columbus, consulting medical aid at Council Bluffs and Omaha. In Omaha they met a Lutheran pastor of the Pennsylvania Synod who tried to induce them to stay to work among German settlers in Nebraska. This may have led to Fikenscher's travels the next year, which have been noted in chapter VII, for they had to promise to request pastors for Nebraska from their synod. This account also appears K. B. II, 9, 71, 72.

Deer Creek through the winter. The two missionaries, again with aid from Twiss, returned to Iowa in December.[37]

The synod had already come to the realization that in the Indian mission it had an undertaking on its hands which overtaxed its strength. It will be remembered that the Gesellschaft had insisted that direction must rest with the synod. There is no record of any formal assumption of such a responsibility by the synod. It had, however, accepted Schmidt and had at least sanctioned his movements. It had also negotiated with Buffalo for support and in some way it had established a mission committee.[38] In the spring of 1859 Schmidt had presented the plans for the mission among the Crows to the ministerial conference which met at Wartburg and it had approved by adopting several regulations.[39] This series of actions had in fact made the mission a synodical project. In the spring, no doubt, there had been prevalent a belief that adequate support would be forthcoming from Germany. But as has been noted, there had been difficulty about this and there was actually a debt, while the prospects of further support were no longer certain.[40] These factors induced the ministerial conference at Galena in September 1860 to reconsider the synod's connection with the Indian mission. It could not from its own means continue the work beyond the present year, but it seemed likely that the German friends would place the responsibility on its shoulders. It formally issued a declaration to Loehe therefore, that it could not carry the mission on its own resources, that the *Gesellschaft* might either assume direction and support, or that if unable to do so, it should advise the synod as to its continuation.[41]

---

[37] Chronik, 33; K. M. 1860, 4, 25-26. Twiss gave Indian ponies to the missionaries for the return and provided accommodations for those remaining behind. The missionaries reached the decision to return among themselves, but may have informed the mission committee of the decision. These accounts give December as the month of return, but in a letter dated November 18, printed K. M. 1860, 3, 19-22, S. Fritschel reported their impending return. They may, however, have written from Des Moines, for he reports that they already were in Iowa.

[38] No record of a formal creation of this committee can be found. The first mention of it is in the letter cited in footnote 23, but it may have been created by the president. The first session after the convention of 1858 was noted in footnote 29.

[39] Chronik, 27, records that it designated Schmidt, Braeuninger, two missionaries and two assistants, expected from Germany, and two colonists to go. Also that the mission station was to form a separate Praepositur or district for purposes of church government and that the mission committee should serve as the link between the mission and the ministerium. Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Wartburg, March 24-28, 1859, indicates suggestions rather than regulations.

---

[40] See footnote 31. Deindoerfer writing to Loehe in January 1860 mentioned debts, stating that what the congregations could raise barely sufficed to cover them, they could therefore not have been large, *K. M.* 1860, 4, 28. S. Fritschel in writing in November 1859 alluded to uncertainty in regard to further support from the *Centralverein*, according to M. Loehe's letter. He also referred to a report on the Gesellschaft in the preceding year, *K. M.* 1859, 8, 9, particularly 65-67, which had disclaimed financial responsibility for the synod and noted that for the Indian mission, the *Centralverein* had replaced the *Gesellschaft* and, contemplating the day when Iowa should become able to stand on its own feet entirely, had assured the members that the *Gesellschaft* would then seek a new outlet. Fritschel took this to mean that complete withdrawal was under contemplation. An editor's note replied that a careful reading did not justify such an interpretation, which seems to be true, and that the *Gesellschaft* was not now contemplating withdrawal, *K. M.* 1860, 3, 21, 22. Undoubtedly, however, this article had been read in the synod and Fritschel may have expressed the general reaction.

The conference also considered an alternative. Schmidt's report from Columbus had indicated the possibility of opening a mission among the Yanktons much nearer at hand and therefore much less costly. The mission committee was directed to make inquiries from Agent Redfield.[42] The inquiry was made and Redfield replied that the Yanktons were then living on the north bank of the Missouri about 120 miles above Sioux City. They had sold most of their land and were on a reservation, but had not settled down to an agricultural life, though he would like to have them do so. Redfield would welcome a mission among them, however, he had no funds to give it support. Funds for educational purposes existed, but there was no school as yet. Employment could be given to laborers and the agent would welcome men of good moral character. One trader, licensed by Redfield, was stationed there and would also welcome a mission.[43] Although this reply seems to have opened a promising opportunity, nothing was done about it. Deindoerfer mentioned the possibility of sending Kessler there to German supporters,[44] but he was then uncertain of adequate support for the Crow mission. When that support became assured all available means were given to the latter. It may be that an opportunity was here neglected, which might have led to greater success than the remoter enterprise was destined to have.

---

[41] Chronik, 29, 30; Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Galena, September 16-20, 1859. No official reply is extant, but the Gesellschaft did not assume direction, although as will be noted it furnished support. It may also have been instrumental in regaining support from the Centralverein, though M. Loehe's letter had already hinted that this too would be adjusted. At any rate, it too gave further support. These complications in themselves indicate how difficult direction from Germany would have been.

[42] Chronik, 30. No abandonment of the Crow mission seems to have been contemplated, however, at least pending a reply from Germany. It was believed that no additional men would be needed there the next year, and the purpose seems to have been to send the remaining mission workers to the Yanktons the next year, rather than to the Crows, because that could be done with less expense. Schmidt and Doederlein, of course, had not yet returned with pleas for more support at that time. Here also the membership of the mission committee is given, Deindoerfer, S. Fritschel, Schueller, to whom Klindworth was added, replacing S. Fritschel as treasurer. From a remark in Schmidt's cited letter, it may be that Dietz had been a member.

Schmidt and Doederlein thus returned to a precarious situation in the fall of 1859. The news of their return came as an unwelcome shock, partly because no means were available or in prospect for meeting their desire to return to Deer Creek with a supply train in the spring, but more, because it was feared that their return would be interpreted as a failure of the enterprise and make it even more difficult to get the needed support. The decision to return seems to have aroused considerable criticism, but the mission committee acknowledged that there had been sound reasons for it and pointed out that it did not constitute an abandonment of the mission.[45] The committee then sought information from Schmidt in regard to the costs of the needed supplies if acquired from traders at Deer Creek, and learned that because of high costs, they would run to about $400 a year. It was decided to report this to Germany and to ask for the funds. The men at Deer Creek were to be informed of this and encouraged to hold out. They might use their own judgment in the spring, whether they should proceed into Crow territory to found a station there, or remain at Deer Creek and begin work among the Indians in charge of Major Twiss there. The latter choice would not preclude the eventual accomplishment of the former. Schmidt and Doederlein were given temporary assignments as pastors at Sauk, Wisconsin, and Jackson, Missouri.[46] Both applied for dismissal from the mission service at the next convention, Schmidt's request was granted for reasons of health, but Doederlein was referred to the *Gesellschaft*.[47]

---

[43] German copy of letter from Redfield, Yankton Agency, Dakota Territory, December 1, 1859, enclosed with letter, Schmidt - Deindoerfer, undated, type copy in I. S. D. Schmidt's letter suggests that there was no need of writing to Redfield again, but proposes sending someone to make a personal investigation. This may mean that Schmidt had already written to Redfield and that the inquiry directed by the Galena Conference was unnecessary.

[44] K. M. 1860, 4, 28. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Madison, December 18, 1859, in I. S. D. interprets the reply as not giving much hope.

---

[45] Chronik, 33, comments that the return boded no good for the mission and that it was variously judged. K. M. 1860, 4, 25 and 27-28, points out that it had been carefully considered decision of the entire group and that four men remained, whose support was less expensive than that of six to carry on the work. However, although the mission had not been abandoned, that impression could easily be created, and the committee would have preferred a different course. This was written by Deindoerfer, whose tone seems to imply that he was one of the critics. S. Fritschel's letter, Ibid., 3, 20, 21, expresses surprise, almost shock at the news of the return, for which the reasons were as yet unknown, but notes that the mission would not suffer, because four men remained, among them Braeuninger who was considered the mainstay, and that four men could more readily be supported by existing means than six. Whether the other two could return in the spring was doubtful, but perhaps they could go to the Yanktons, which would cost much less.

[46] Chronik, 33; K. M. 1860, 4, 26-28.

The group that had been left behind at Deer Creek meanwhile was facing grave difficulties. The attitude of Major Twiss, friendly at first, veered toward indifference for a time. They began construction of a cabin, but lacked means, and faced hunger. They found a new friend, however, in Captain Reynolds who was wintering there in the course of an expedition commanded by him to explore the Yellowstone. The captain raised $60 from the members of his group for them and was to give them further valuable assistance and advice.[48] Some support also seems to have arrived from Iowa and the two colonists found work and earned $100 which they contributed to the cause.[49] On Christmas Eve, 1859, the missionaries secured a tree and decorated it with trimmings brought from Iowa. They invited white men and Indians from the small settlement and held a service and distributed gifts to the Indians.[50] When the missionaries were informed of the choice offered them by the mission committee, they decided to move on in the early spring to establish a station in the territory of the Crows. Seeking advice from Reynolds and other local white men they selected a site on the Big Horn River some 300 miles distant,

---

[47] Doederlein had probably signed an agreement to remain in the mission service until released. No record of his release is extant, but he did not reenter the service and as noted elsewhere eventually left the synod. His relationships with Missouri may have influenced the request. See his letter to Grossmann, Jackson, October 28, 1861, in I. S. D. The letter also refers to a request for compensation for books, which he had left behind at Deer Creek and the return of which he had requested in earlier letters but which apparently had been lost. As for Schmidt, the *Centralverein* expressed a wish that he might be returned to the field, and in the spring of 1860 he was asked to go out again and made preparations to do so. Finances, however, did not permit sending him. Then he asked for a temporary dismissal on grounds of health and the mission committee granted it and advised him to defer his marriage no longer, which under the circumstances must have amounted to dismissal, perhaps pending approval of synod. His health was such, that he found it difficult, as noted elsewhere, even to serve the usual far-flung parish and he also never returned to the mission. The mission committee also noted that Buffalo sources had charged Schmidt with misusing mission funds for visits to his fiancee in Detroit and emphatically denied the charge, *K*. *B*. III, 10, 73-4.

[48] A report on the mission, *K*. *B*. III, 10, 73, refers to a change in the attitude of Major Twiss, without giving details. At a later time he was again friendly and helpful. The report

---

also mentions the services of Captain Reynolds and *Chronik*, 34, indicates that he had been helpful in securing credit, but this came a little later. The gift is reported in a letter, Braeuninger - Schmidt, November 28, 1859, of which extracts are printed *K. B.* IV, 8, 58-9. It mentions the cabin and going hungry. A receipt is *Ibid.*, III, 1, 8, listing thirteen contributors of $2-$5. This gift is also mentioned, *K. M.* 1860, 4, 28.

[49] A report from Braeuninger on basis of a letter from him, dated February 10, 1860, mentioned having $156.50 on hand of which according to an editorial note the colonists had earned and given $100. Bunge later in the year left the mission and entered the Missouri institution at Fort Wayne, letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Waucoma, November 27, 1860. He later claimed that he lent the $50 he had earned and asked for its repayment. The *Ausschuss* investigated, found the claim unjustified, but agreed to pay him $50 if he would withdraw the claim and apply for the payment, *Protokollbuch*, *Ausschuss* Minutes, August 14, 1862. He did so, *Ibid.*, February 15, 1864.

[50] *K. B.* III, 2, 1. Captain Reynolds read the lesson in English and played on the flute, while Braeuninger read in German and played on the violin. The white men were greatly moved, but when one of them told the Indians in their language that the Great Spirit had sent the missionaries and the gifts, one Indian woman inquired why he had sent such small portions and not barrels of flour, etc.

where they believed an agricultural colony could succeed. They believed that journey and location would be safe, danger threatened only from the Blackfeet. The amount promised them, $300-$400, should be adequate, but it was important that they get an early start during March. The journey might take five weeks and planting must be done by the beginning of May, otherwise early frosts would not permit crops to mature.[51]

Trader Bissonette at Deer Creek was helpful in furnishing information, promising to supply them with provisions cheaply, and in hauling goods from Fort Laramie without charges. Captain Reynolds would save them a trip to Fort Laramie, since he was going there himself and would do their buying and he could probably do it cheaper than they themselves.[52] They also asked that Doederlein and Schmidt, be sent back immediately, so that when they arrived in Crow territory, two men could always travel with the Indians, while the others remained at the station. To a degree these plans were carried out although the mission committee planned to send only Schmidt and was unable to do even that. The reason seems to have been that costs ran about $150 higher than estimated and that the missionaries remained indebted to Captain Reynolds to that amount.[53] The start, somewhat delayed, was made on April 10, Braeuninger, Seyler and Beck undertaking the arduous journey. They proceeded only about 100 miles, however, halting on the Powder River, where they established a station. Difficulty of maintaining communications was given as the reason for the change of plans.[54] A cabin and some other structures were erected at once, sod was broken, corn, potatoes, and vegetables

---

[51] The data are from a letter by Braeuninger February 10, 1860, published in part in K. B. III, 4, 25, 26. They stressed the need of the early start in order to speed the sending of money and of orders to carry out the project, asking that word to this effect should be in St. Joseph by March 1. They asked for $300 in addition to the $156.50 they had.

[52] Ibid. Reynolds reported that he found the missionaries God-fearing and devoted men, but ignorant of the world and of the English language and in consequence poorly fitted for the task they had undertaken. He took satisfaction in having helped them prosecute their undertaking and in making their winter more comfortable than it would otherwise have been and noted that they left a few days before he did for a site near the lower canyon of the Big Horn which he had recommended. Reynolds, Bvt. Brig. Gen. W. F., Exploration of the Yellowstone River, Senate Ex. Doc. No. 77, 40th Congress, 1st Session, 75, 76.

---

[53] Letter, Braeuninger - Prof. (S.) Fritschel, Deer Creek, April 9, 1860, in I. S. D. The letter gives an accounting of stock and supplies and states that Braeuninger insisted on adequate supplies. It mentions that the costs to Bissonette ran higher than estimated and mentions a debt to Reynolds of $150. and gives instructions on how to pay it. Braeuninger expected Schmidt to join him by the river route to Fort Union, and described arrangements for having him met and guided by some of Twiss' men, but preferred the Oregon trail as a travel route. He mentioned that they were leaving for the Big Horn the next day. See also K. B. III, 8, 62-64.

[54] No really satisfactory explanation for the change of plans in regard to the location of the station is given. Braeuninger wrote on the eve of departure that they were going to the Big Horn and Reynolds had the same belief. See footnotes 52 and 53. In June Braeuninger returned to Deer Creek alone, a venture of which he himself said that he would characterize as reckless if it were not made in the cause of the mission. The purpose is not clear, it seems that he returned for supplies and stock and perhaps for mail. He mentions that in the present location they were only 100 miles from a post office and that another 180 miles would cause heavy transportation expenses. To found a colony such as many friends of the mission wished it, would cost $10,000. From the Powder River they could also reach the Indians of the Platte. Letter from Braeuninger, Deer Creek, June 24, 1860, published in part K. B. III, 8, 62-64; Missionsblatt, 1860, 20, 156-8. A report based on another letter mentions that there were no buffalo at the site chosen and that this factor had been taken into

---

consideration in order not to arouse the hostility of the Indians, K. M. 1860, 8, 9 and 10, 56, 57. Both this source and the preceding one, however, say that other game abounded and in the former Braeuninger also speaks of good water, timber, and fertile land. A settlement in such a site could hardly have been very pleasing to Indians inclined to be hostile. The other factors should have been known in advance. It seems to the writer that the urgent necessity for the establishment of a self-supporting agricultural colony was the real reason for the change of plan. Braeuninger had stressed getting under way in March and had mentioned early May as the latest planting time. But it was about mid-April before the start was made, and by Braeuninger's time-estimate for the journey it would be mid-May before the Big Horn region could be reached. If no harvest could be gathered the station could not be held through the next winter. These considerations probably induced the missionaries to look for a site where farming appeared to be feasible. Seyler had according to Braeuninger's letter of February 10, explored the prospective route with some of Bissonette's men as far as the Powder River in the winter. He may have reported favorably on the site and when the group reached this point, it may have confirmed Seyler's report and decided to stay there. When Braeuninger had travelled with the Crows in 1858 they had ranged through the Powder River country, so that prospects of reaching them from a station there may have appeared good. The last cited report in K. M. mentioned travel difficulties meaning perhaps that more time than expected was consumed and intimated that the group had arrived at the Powder River at just the right time for plowing and that it was done at once. It seems probable therefore that the missionaries decided that they could not reach the Big Horn country in time to be able to maintain themselves there and that they chose the Powder River as an advantageous site where self-support would be possible and good prospects of getting in touch with the Crows existed.

It is possible that the withdrawal of colonist Bunge left the group seriously short-handed and had something to do with the decision to locate on the Powder River. There seems to be no record of the date of this withdrawal. In the text the writer has not included Bunge in the group that left Deer Creek on April 10, because the letter of April 9 does not mention him, while it does mention Beck and Seyler and because the letter of June 24 writes of the difficulty of traveling alone and mentions Beck and Seyler as having remained behind alone at the station. On the other hand the last cited report in K. M. mentions Bunge among those who founded the station on the Powder River. This notice states, however, that no official report from Braeuninger had yet arrived, but that a private letter contained the news. It is possible therefore that Bunge refused to go along at the last moment after planted and fencing begun.[55] Amidst arduous labors the missionary group established itself in a location from which it hoped the Crows would be accessible and requested more men, so that when the contacts were made, it would be possible to travel with them in alternation, while a number of men would always remain in charge of the station.[56]

The mission committee was by the summer of 1860 facing a somewhat easier situation. Appeals to Germany had not been fruitless. It was able to pay most of the indebtedness incurred at Deer Creek and had prospects of receiving consider-

---

Braeuninger's letter of April 9 had been sent. This would account for leaving stock behind, which Braeuninger came to get in June and for a delayed journey, which found it impossible to reach the Big Horn in the time estimated. Braeuninger's letter of June 24 is not extant in MS., but was published in part in the *K. B.* It does not mention Bunge, but the relevant section may have been withheld from publication. The wording of the letter does not exclude the possibility, however, that in writing of the difficulties of traveling alone, Braeuninger may have had the return trip in mind. It is also possible therefore that Bunge went with the group, but decided during the journey to withdraw and that this factor had weight in the decision to stop at the Powder River. Either someone would have to return to Deer Creek with him and return alone with the stock or one man would have to remain at the station alone for many weeks.

[55] *K. M.* 1860, 8, 9 and 10, 57, 58. They formally dedicated their cabin on Whitsunday in May. They had a fine stand of corn and looked forward to an early harvest of beans and melons.

[56] *K. B.* III, 8, 62-64. Braeuninger mentioned that as it was, his own labor was required and he could not travel. Braeuninger wrote that he was including sketches of the Powder River location and drawings of the station, somewhat stiff, but fairly accurate. The writer has not been able to find the originals. Reproductions appear in E. G. Fritschel, "A History of the Indian Mission of the Lutheran Iowa Synod, 1856 to 1866," an unpublished bachelor's thesis in the library of Wartburg Seminary.

able additional support.[57] In the spring, however, the committee did not yet see its way clear to grant the request for more men. It contented itself with adopting regulations which placed Braeuninger in charge of the mission.[58] The mission was also discussed at the convention of the synod in June. There seems still to have existed doubt whether synod could carry the enterprise, for it was suggested that the Centralverein take over the direction. S. Fritschel, who was in that year sent to Europe to deal with the seminary debts, was asked to take up this matter also and to win support for the mission generally. The Centralverein was no more willing than the Gesellschaft had been to assume direction and it remained with the synod.[59] Soon after the convention, however, additional funds arrived from Germany and the decision was then taken to send two more men. The committee would have liked to send Schmidt, but his health prevented a new journey.

---

[57] The absence of a financial record makes it impossible to give definite figures on costs. *Chronik*, 34, refers to receipt of $400 from the *Centralverein*, to whom Loehe had referred the appeal sent to him. *K. M.* 1860, 8, 9 and 10, 57 mentions $400 from Neuendettelsau *which* may refer to the same contribution or to an additional one. It also mentions another $400 from the *Centralverein* which arrived after news had come of the establishment of the station on the Powder River and therefore must be additional to the contribution first mentioned in *Chronik* which was reported to a committee session on May 9. It is *thus* possible that $1,200, and certain that at least $800 were received. A letter, Rehwoldt - Grossmann, July 27, 1860, in I. S. D. contains a long postscript by Klindworth, who writes that Rehwoldt brought apparently reliable word that the *Centralverein* would contribute 3,000 Gulden or $1,200 during the current year. *Chronik* also mentions that it was possible to pay most of the *debts*. The $400 plus the $156 (see footnote 49) which the missionaries had at hand in February may therefore have sufficed to pay the costs of the expedition, including the debt to Captain Reynolds, but not to have left anything over to send Schmidt as then planned. There seem to have been additional debts to Bissonette, for Braeuninger's letter in *K. B.* III, 8, 62-64 mentions that he would wait a year for *payment*. From the later receipts money was therefore available for paying the remaining debts and for sending more men with more equipment. That rumors of the return of Schmidt and Doederlein had led to fear in Germany that the expedition of 1859 had been a failure and had done some harm is clear from a letter, M. Loehe - Grossmann, S and G. Fritschel, Fuerth, February 3, 1860, in I. S. D. Letters from students had set them afloat and lack of an official report as well as of accounts for the expedition, plus consternation over the costs had caused uneasiness. Loehe wrote that a frank report on failure would hurt much less than rumors. Deindoerfer's frank letter, describing the situation, giving estimates and discussing the possibilities, including that of staying at Deer Creek and abandoning a station in Crow Territory cited before, *K. M.* 1860, 4, 25-29, had apparently restored confidence and led to renewed support.

---

[58] Chronik, 34. Establishment of a separate local jurisdiction had been authorized at the Conference in March 1859. Ibid., 27. Braeuninger on April 9 had written that he was taking charge, but that he wished to have his authority defined. The account in Chronik does not specify what was done, but later it appears that one of the missionaries was in charge and it seems probable that the request was granted. Probably Schmidt had been in charge until he left. Chronik also mentions that it was necessary to adjust differences between the members of the committee caused by the unexpected return of the missionaries the preceding fall.

[59] No report was published for the convention of 1860. K. B. III, 7, gave an account, but it merely refers to report of the mission committee without details and to a favorable reference in the presidential report, 52. Deindoerfer in a later report, K. B. III, 10, 73-4, refers to instructions given by the synod to S. Fritschel to regulate German relations in its interest. Chronik, 39, notes the request about direction and its refusal. Here also is a statement, perhaps referring to the point discussed in the preceding footnote, that synod was asked to elect a more suitable committee, but that action was postponed. It is possible, however, that it was difficult to bring the committee together as quickly as was sometimes desirable and that this was the basis for the request.

Krebs and Flachenecker, who had spent a year at the seminary, since their deferment in 1859, now volunteered. They were consecrated in July and left in August,[60] but though they did not yet know it, even at the time of their departure tragedy had struck and the mission on the Powder River had been abandoned.

Braeuninger had left Deer Creek, probably in July, after having heard that the Crows would receive their presents from the government at Deer Creek and was in high hopes that he would soon meet them, since their way would lead them past the Powder River station.[61] He returned safely and not alone after all, because Twiss had sent two men along who were to carry the invitation to the Crows, who not only accompanied the missionary, but shot game for his men, before they went on.[62] The group then began to erect a church. After some two weeks, Indians began to visit them, but not Crows, war parties of Sioux tribes. One small party of three Ogallala stopped but briefly. A second larger one of fifty warriors, Ogallala and a few Hunkpapa stayed several days, begged a good deal, and the Hunkpapa uttered threats.[63] A few days later a small party of six came who claimed to be Ogallala, stayed over night, but gave no sign of unfriendliness.[64] After their departure Braeuninger and Beck went to get the cattle in the direction opposite to that which the Indians had taken several hours earlier and were surprised when they met them some little distance away in some bushes. They mentioned that they had heard a rifle report and expressed the fear that Blackfeet might be in the vicinity. At their request, Braeuninger promised to conceal them and sent Beck on alone after the cattle in order to return to the station with the Indians. Beck crossed the river and did not return by the same route, though he saw from a distance that the meeting place was now empty. He returned unmolested, but neither Braeuninger nor the Indians were at the station and though he and Seyler, who had heard nothing, searched until darkness fell, they could discover nothing of either.[65]

---

[60] Deindoerfer reported on their selection, K. B. III, 10, 74, and noted their consecration, Missionsblatt, 1860, 21, 165. A letter from Klindworth, unaddressed, Galena, August 16, 1860, in I. S. D. reports them there, preparing for departure and that he was having them buy supplies and was giving them $300 to take along. The writer was unable to find a notice of the time of their arrival, but a letter written by Krebs from Deer Creek was dated September 26, 1860, Missionsblatt, 1861, 1, 3. Chronik, 41, gives August 12 as the date of consecration, and the time of their departure was given as the week of August 12 in the K. B. reference above. Since they were still in Galena August 16 and since the news of Braeuninger's death was at Wartburg on August 22, see letter, G. Fritschel-Deindoerfer of that date in I. S. D., they only barely missed its reception. That letter also indicates that an attempt was made to reach them at St. Louis, through a letter asking them to await instructions from the mission committee. The writer thought, however, that this notice would no longer reach them, and it did not.

[61] This statement was made in Braeuninger's letter of June 24, printed K. B. III, 8, 62-64 and Missionsblatt, 1860, 21, 156-158.

---

[62] In Krebs report cited below in footnote 65. The letter above in footnote 61 had noted that Twiss had been exceedingly friendly and had given a variety of supplies to the missionaries.

[63] The Hunkpapa came one night and wished to exchange a worn blanket for a good one. When this was refused, they said that they were going on an expedition against the Shoshones. If on their return the missionaries were still there they would kill them and plunder their belongings. They then cut the desired blanket in half and took one half for the worn one. Braeuninger finally gave each of them half of the cut blanket, but the Ogallala later returned both parts and assured the missionaries that they were friends and would punish the Hunkpapa for any further outrages. The group did a good deal of begging, but was not hostile and left peaceably.

[64] They wished to sell Braeuninger a pair of mocassins, which he refused, but there was no trouble over the incident. One of thamreloaded his gun with three balls, but made no comment. Braeuninger thought this was done because they were in fear of meeting enemies. Later reports had it that the gun was loaded for him.

The mystery of exactly what happened to Braeuninger has never been really solved. Beck and Seyler spent an anxious night, but were not molested. They spent the next two days searching the vicinity in a two-mile radius and the river, which at that time was high and rapid, without finding either the body or traces of violence. They then buried what they could not take of their property and returned to Deer Creek. Major Twiss there furnished a man with whom they returned and searched the entire vicinity for several days more, again without result. Twiss and Bissonette tried to get information from Indians and frontiersmen, but no one had heard anything. Braeuninger had disappeared on July 23, late in September word finally arrived from Fort Laramie. Ogallala Indians there related that Hunkpapa, who pretended to be Ogallala had deliberately murdered the chief of the white men on the Powder River, when they found him alone outside. It had been their intention to murder him, or if they could not get at him alone, all three men, because they objected to a white settlement on the Powder River.[66] The missionaries were not entirely satisfied with this account, but they accepted the fact of Braeuninger's death.[67]

---

[65] The account follows a report by Missionary Krebs, written at Deer Creek, October 4, 1860, and printed, K. B. III, 12, 89-93, with an obituary from which it appears that Braeuninger was not yet twenty-four years old. With some additions, the letter is also in K. M. 1861, 1 and 2, 1-12, and with some omissions and additions in Missionsblatt 1860, 24, 188-192. Somewhat earlier reports, but not materially different are in Missionsblatt 1860, 21, 161-166 and K. B. III, 10, 74-5. The details in footnotes 62 to 64 are also from the Krebs report.

---

[66] Ibid. The story as it came from Fort Laramie, followed the details known to the missionaries faithfully. The actual murder according to it was committed about a mile from the scene of the encounter and about a quarter of a mile from the station at a thicket there. Five of the Indians had changed their minds and were trying to dissuade the murderer, the warrior who had loaded his gun in the house with the intent of killing Braeuninger some hours earlier and who at the time had impressed the missionaries as the friendliest of the lot. He insisted that now that the chance was at hand he would carry out his plan and shot Braeuninger in the back, breaking it. When he tried to arise, the Indians dispatched and scalped him and threw the body into a deep hole in the river.

[67] The missionaries were not sure that Ogallala were not the culprits and worried about not having heard the shot, though one man was in the house nearby and another outside, though across the river and farther away, and also about the lack of traces. They explained the fact that the body was not found by the high stage of the river. They intended, however, to conduct another search for it. If they did, they found nothing. They themselves seem to have thought of a capture. In home circles this opinion at first was widespread. A letter, G. Fritschel - Deindoerfer, August 22, 1860, type copy in I. S. D., expressed this opinion strongly and mentioned writing to Seyler, who had sent the news, to investigate the

This tragedy spelled the end of the Powder River Station. According to the reports of the survivors, Braeuninger himself had become doubtful of the location and had expressed the opinion that settlement of fifteen to twenty well-armed men would be required, if the station was to be safe against hostile war parties.[68] Although Schmidt seconded this suggestion and thought it feasible, the mission committee, meeting in September, was of the opinion that it was too costly and unsuitable for winning the friendship of the Indians. It instructed the missionaries to establish a new station at Deer Creek with a farm, where they might be safe in the vicinity of the fort. They were to try to contact the Crows and to have

---

possibility and enlist the aid of the Crows, if they came. He would also write to the government for instructions to its officers to investigate and to Schmidt for advice on what to do. A letter, Schmidt - Deindoerfer, Detroit, August 31, 1860, in I. S. D., doubted whether much could be done through the government, though it would not hurt to try and held that the aid of a nearby military post should have been enlisted at once. He too believed in capture, however, rather than death, but was inclined to suspect traders or Indian agents as instigators, if it were death, and for that reason placed no great confidence in their aid. *Chronik*, 41, records that the belief in capture persisted for some time. The report in *K. B.* III, 10, 74, expressed it as hope. *Missionsblatt*, 1860, 20, 158, gave it as a possibility in a notice appended to the publication of Braeuninger's letter of June 24. After Krebs made his full report the hope seems to have died. *Ibid.*, 21, 161, repeated the hope and noted that contacts had been made with the government and with Major Twiss and even with Capt. Reynolds to secure information and aid, 164. There is a biography of Braeuninger in *Missionsblatt*, 1861, running through 188-221.

[68] *Ibid.*, 163; *K. B.* III, 10, 75. Braeuninger had suggested withdrawal to Deer Creek as an alternative.

two men constantly traveling with them as Braeuninger and Schmidt had done in 1858, except during the winter months. During that season they might engage several Indian families to live with them as hunters in contact with whom they might improve knowledge of the language gained during trips, so that they might begin to present the Gospel to the Indians. Alternatively they might take young Indians into their station and start a school for them.[69]

It had undoubtedly been a mistake to select the Powder River site. Time was to tell that the Indians objected to any and all white settlement there. It was a much frequented hunting range, which indeed the missionaries were to visit repeatedly when traveling with Indians in the next few years. Nor was the region well chosen from the point of view of establishing contact with the Crows. Sioux and Cheyenne as well as Arapahos were constantly ranging there and all were enemies of the Crows. Possibly the Crows occasionally came there also, Cheyennes accompanied by missionaries at times reported tracks, but they were never encountered and it seems unlikely that they would have frequented the station. Nor were the agricultural possibilities as good as the first enthusiasm of the missionaries imagined and it is not likely that anything approaching nearly complete self-support would have been feasible.[70] It seems obvious that the decision of the mission committee to withdraw to Deer Creek was wise, even though that might involve abandonment of the plan to reach the Crows, a consequence which was not yet clearly understood.

---

[69] Missionsblatt, 1860, 21, 164-5, and Chronik, 41, which also pays tribute to Braeuninger's ability and zeal and notes that the mission had suffered a severe loss in him. Schmidt's letter cited in the second preceding footnote indicates that he had been invited to attend the meeting of the mission committee, which he was unable to do, because of his wedding and asked a number of questions, the answer to some of which are indicated above. He had suggested a fort himself earlier and thought means would be made available from Germany. He did not think that a new missionary should be sent at once, partly because Braeuninger might return and partly because the men in the field now at Deer Creek would need the funds. He agreed to a temporary withdrawal there, but insisted that the mission should try chiefly to reach the Crows. He did not think that much could be done with Cheyennes, Arapahos or Sioux. Apparently, the mission committee was thinking of turning to them, but was dissuaded for its instructions seem still to have specified the Crows as the tribe to be reached.

The missionaries at Deer Creek were willing to return to the Powder River, if the personnel could be increased to six or eight, so that greater numbers might reduce the arrogance of the Indians somewhat, but preferred to retreat to Deer Creek, and welcomed the decision of the mission committee to establish a station there.[71] Major Twiss, who was again friendly and helpful, offered housing and advised choice of a location immediately adjacent to his fort, where irrigation works already existed. The missionaries felt, however, that since they hoped to induce Indians to live with them, they ought not to settle in the immediate vicinity and chose a site in a loop of Deer Creek, with water on three sides, about a mile from the fort and four miles from Bissonette's trading post. Although handicapped by a severe illness which incapacitated Krebs for a long time, the missionaries there erected a cabin, with much aid from Twiss, and broke sod and in the following year undertook construction of a dam for irrigation purposes.[72]

---

[70] A report by Kessler indicated that on a later visit the corn about which Braeuninger had written enthusiastically in June was found withered and dried, K. B. IV, 6, 47. The missionaries had by then come to the conclusion that no successful agriculture was possible without irrigation anywhere in the region. Braeuninger in the often-cited letter of June 24 had been willing to promise that the mission could raise its own food. References to visits to the region with Cheyenne will be given subsequently. It may be noted that the station was found burned and destroyed in 1861, K. B. IV, 10, 74.

[71] Missionsblatt, 1861, 1, 3-5, brings excerpts from a letter written by Krebs at Deer Creek, September 6, 1860, which repeats Braeuninger's worries about the location at the Powder River, because of the frequent visits by war bands, and notes that Seyler had suggested a relocation at Deer Creek,

---

and that Major Twiss had granted permission to locate there, as well as that favorable conditions existed. But they would be willing to abide by a committee decision to return to the Powder River under the conditions given. His next letter of October 4, previously cited from K. B. III, 12, and K. M. 1861, 1 and 2, notes receipt of the direction from the mission committee and unanimous wholehearted approval.

[72] Krebs in the report in K. M. 1861, 1 and 2, 10-11, describes the offer of Twiss, with the remark that Mormons had previously farmed there. Too much close contact with the whites of the fort was not desirable for the Indians. Twiss gave permission to occupy the site chosen, which Krebs says was a mile and a half from the fort, open prairie but within easy reach of timber for fuel and building. In Missionsblatt, 1861, 1, 4, Krebs expressed intentions of building and breaking in the fall and winter. A report by Kessler, K. B. IV, 6, 46-48 notes that the intentions had been carried out and that on his arrival in the spring all was completed except irrigation works and farming was then in process. Twiss' fort was merely a group of cabins, apparently without a stockade. The mission cabin was a log structure 16 x 24. Sketches of it and other Deer Creek structures are in E. Fritschel's thesis. Kessler noted that Twiss had contributed building material and labor. Krebs' illness is reported in a letter, Seyler - Grossmann, November 9, 1860, appended to the type copy of G. Fritschel - Deindoerfer, August 22, 1860, in I. S. D., which also refers to friendliness on the part of Twiss and Bissonette.

Not much mission work was possible during the winter, while this work was being done. A hope that some Crow families might be induced to live with the missionaries came to nothing, because no Crows ventured to Deer Creek. Hopes of making contact with the tribe rose, however, when a report came that it was on the Little Big Horn River. Twiss sent a man with some Indians to invite them to come to Deer Creek for their presents for the past year and Seyler was equipped by Twiss to go along. This venture, however, was also unsuccessful. While the group was spending a night in an Indian camp, hostile Indians staged an attack and stole some horses, including those of the travellers who then had to return to Deer Creek some 200 miles, without having made contact with the Crows.[73] There was a later rumor that the Crows would come to Deer Creek during the summer for their presents, but Kessler no longer put much faith into it. They never came and the mission was never able to get into touch with them.and had to begin working with the Platte River tribes, accessible at Deer Creek, instead.[74]

---

[73] Krebs reported the intention to induce Crows to live at the mission, *K. M.* 1861, 1 and 2, 11. In a letter dated January 10, 1861, printed in part in *Missionsblatt* 1861, 7, 51-53, he reported the project of sending Seyler, noting that the mission committee had sent instructions that two men were to go to the Crows in the spring. Because of the after effects of his illness he could not accompany Seyler on the journey. The journey was to begin from the Powder River and Seyler had to go there first. Deindoerfer also reported the plan, *K. B.* IV, 4, 26-28, and later reported the failure, *Ibid.*, 6, 46.

[74] The rumor is reported *Ibid.* The long and tenacious attempts to establish a mission among the Crows thus had to be abandoned, because of their inaccessibility. A dispassionate analysis of the original journey of Schmidt and Braeuninger should have revealed from the very beginning that

After the death of Braeuninger, there was no longer an ordained missionary in the field. The personnel late in 1860 consisted of Beck, a layman, of deacon Seyler, whose theological studies had not progressed far, and of candidates Krebs and Flachenecker, who were to have been ordained by Braeuninger after their arrival.[75] Since the latter had just left when word of the Powder River tragedy arrived, it was difficult to send another ordained man at once, although

---

they would be difficult to reach. No doubt the costs of the Yellowstone River route, by which they had been reached, were prohibitive, and the opposition of Meldrum would have formed a serious handicap. It was, however, clear even in 1858 that the Crows had come to Deer Creek only with great reluctance. During 1860 it had become clear that the establishment of a station in their territory from Deer Creek would involve prohibitive costs. Hence there was left only the slight chance that some might occasionally come to Deer Creek and that missionaries might then go with them. But this chance too never materialized. In any event, it would have been very difficult to maintain regular connections. The mission committee as early as 1859 contemplated missions among the Platte tribes at Deer Creek. Probably it was the influence of Braeuninger which at that time induced the missionaries to adhere to the original purpose, resulting in the ill-fated Powder River station. When the Deer Creek station was established, it became logical to work with the Indians accessible there. Since neither Schmidt nor Braeuninger were with the mission any more, the missionaries gradually came to realize this. The mission committee seems to have understood it almost at once, for the instruction which Krebs reported as directing two of them to go to the Crows in the spring of 1861 is reported by Deindoerfer as a request to travel with the Crows, or if they could not be found, with other tribes, or with both, Ibid., 4, 27, and in Chronik, 43, 44, as a direction to undertake a trip to find the Crows at once, and if they could not be found, to select some other tribe at their own discretion.

[75] The letter, G. Fritschel - Deindoerfer, August 22, 1860, implies that ordination by Braeuninger on arrival was contemplated, for it mentioned the previously noted attempt to reach the missionaries at St. Louis and gave as the reason that their ordination before departure was now desirable.

Schmidt volunteered to go and C. Kessler, who had been deferred in 1859 also declared himself ready to go when approached.[76] Lack of means and hope that Braeuninger might be found living induced the mission committee to defer action for a time. The hope, however, soon faded and the men in the field urged that a man be sent to replace Braeuninger as head of the mission. In January 1861 it was resolved to send Kessler as soon as means were available. The Centralverein again furnished means and Kessler left Galena April 4, 1861, and after an arduous journey arrived at Deer Creek on April 17. He ordained Krebs and Flachenecker immediately and thus the mission was again well staffed and in a position to comply with directions to travel with the Indians and to pursue actual missionary activities, after a winter devoted chiefly to colonization.[77]

Kessler came with instructions to undertake a missionary trip at once, and immediately began preparations for making it. Horses were bought and he, Krebs and Seyler set out for the

---

[76] Deindoerfer's report on Braeuninger's death in Missionsblatt, 1860, 21, 165, dated September 24, 1860, reports the facts in regard to Schmidt, whose offer was not accepted because of his health, and Kessler. In K. B. III, 10, 75, Deindoerfer reported that Kessler was ready to go at once if means were available.

[77] Schmidt's letter to Deindoerfer, August 31, 1860, thought it inadvisable to send another man until the news of Braeuninger's death was confirmed. Chronik, 43-4, reports the decision to send Kessler. S. Fritschel, then in Europe, was to approach the Gesellschaft for funds. Krebs requested Kessler as head, if possible, at once from Deer Creek October 4, 1860, K. M. 1861, 1 and 2, 11. Chronik reports that the Centralverein furnished $400 so that Kessler could be commissioned April 1. The data about his trip are in K. B. IV, 6, 46-47 and the report on the ordination of the others is Ibid., 7, 52-3.

Powder River in the hope of locating a camp of the Arapaho, whom they thought friendly to the Crows and through whom they hoped they might be enabled to make a contact with the latter after all. They struck cold rainy weather and lacking a tent, suffered severely from illness. They had only one packhorse to carry supplies and were not successful at hunting. After about two weeks their supplies were gone and they had to return, without having met Indians of any kind.[78] The missionaries thereafter did not undertake journeys of their own, but sought permission to join Indian bands who came to Deer Creek and its vicinity, hoping to find hosts who would take them into their tents and supply them with food, while they would pick up the language, preparatory to beginning mission work. It proved difficult to find such an opportunity, however. During the early summer an Arapaho encampment moved around in the immediate vicinity for some time and the missionaries tried hard to win their friendship and to secure an invitation. But it was all in vain, these Indians were suspicious and would not even teach them their language.[79] There were also a few Cheyenne, whom they found much friendlier and cleaner, but their plans were indefinite. The missionaries tried to induce a family to settle down and stay with them so that they might learn the language and instruct them, but could induce them to stay only short periods, though they made some progress with the language. At length, however, a larger group departed for the Powder River and agreed to take two of them along. Some danger was involved for there was talk of meeting a Sioux band with whom war was to be made on other tribes, but Kessler and Flachenecker went along, leaving August 2, 1861.[80]

---

[78] The instruction is in Chronik, 43-4; it included directions to make a last attempt to find the Crows before turning to other tribes. The journey is reported by Deindoerfer, K. B. IV, 10, 73, who calls it another failure and blames lack of means which made it impossible to furnish enough supplies and an indispensable tent and made a strong appeal to his readers for generous giving for the mission. It was on this occasion that the Powder River station was found burned. The preparations and the purpose had been reported in 6, 47, 48, with the notation that the four horses cost $200. The missionaries seem to have expected to find the Crows for they planned that in that event one of them might stay with the Arapaho and two should go with the Crows. In a later report, 7, 52-3, it is stated that the journey began on May 2.

---

[79] See a report from Krebs, dated August 10, 1861, printed K. B. IV, 10, 74-5, and with more detail in Missionsblatt, 1861, 21, 22, 161-165; 169-175. The Arapaho seem to have been the only Indians in the vicinity during most of the time. They were a large camp mostly of women and children, since most of the men were away to wage war on the Ute. The missionaries hesitated under these circumstances to seek too much contact, because incidents in which men offered their wives or women themselves were common. Indians came to them frequently, usually to beg. After the men returned there was a counter-attack from the Ute and much confusion. It appeared that the Arapaho intended to go to Pike's Peak to beg from mining settlements there and the missionaries did not wish to join in such an expedition, nor could they afford to supply themselves for the trip, or have much hope of keeping the supplies for their own use if they did. When it appeared at length that the camp might go to the Powder River to hunt, no invitation could be secured, though permission to go along was not refused outright. The Arapaho seem to have been suspicious of attempts to learn their language and demanded high rewards. Only two words were picked up.

[80] Ibid. The Cheyenne also did a good deal of begging, but rendered some services in return. They too had the

In 1860 the mission committee had still contemplated a colony in connection with the mission and had instructed the missionaries to engage in farming, and as noted, they had begun to do so. In January 1861, however, this policy was reversed. The missionaries were instructed to that effect. Since the colonist, Beck, was not recalled, the scope of this new policy is not altogether clear. The committee seems to have had in mind that the station be retained and it may have thought of Beck as caretaker and to have intended that the remaining personnel live with the Indians as Indians during warm seasons so as to need support at the station only during the winter months. It had arrived at the conclusion that the colonization plan was too expensive, hoped that expenditures could be reduced in this way, and planned that if S. Fritschel could win additional support in Europe, the means for conducting it in this way could be secured. If an increased flow of means resulted, colonization might be resumed at a later time.[81]

Pike's Peak region in mind for a time. At the departure two Indians each invited one of the missionaries into their tents. Some small gifts were given them, and the missionaries sent a small amount of supplies along.

[81] *Chronik*, 43-4; *Missionsblatt*, 1861, 7, 53; *K. B.* IV, 4, 26-8. They had the example of Braeuninger and Schmidt among the Crows in 1858 in mind when they wrote of living as Indians with the Indians. There is, however, no definite statement that all missionaries were to be out on journeys all summer. S. Fritschel's *Bericht* to Deindoerfer notes that he secured annual contributions of about $100 from a missionary society at Luebeck under Dr. Lindenberg, which was received from 1861 for the duration of the Indian mission.

The missionaries did not readily fall in with this new procedure. It is not clear just when they were informed of it, but when Kessler arrived in the spring of 1861 he found farming operations under way and wrote back that the group had decided not to give up the farm. Three of the men then went on a journey, but not only did they leave two behind, includone ordained man, but they were not gone long and thereafter all remained at Deer Creek, although, as has been noted, somewhat involuntarily and not without working among the Indians in the vicinity, until August. The agricultural results were not good, for they did not yet get their irrigation plant into effective operation, and their crops were parched or devoured by pests. Nevertheless they proceeded to improve their dam for the next year.[82]

The reaction of the mission committee is not recorded. It was relieved of the direction of the mission not long afterward by the Convention of 1861. After it had made its report, S. Fritschel reported that his attempt to get the Centralverein to assume direction of the undertaking had failed. The synod, thus driven at last to take charge, placed the direction into the hands of the *Ausschuss*.[83] This body had to deal with the colonization question and with a number of other points of difficulty. It seems to have sent directions to abandon the farm, for in the spring of 1862 Kessler resigned as head of the mission over this and some other matters, including a request for a new train of supplies, which had apparently been requested and refused.[84] Clearly financial difficulties were the core of the problem. While neither the Ausschuss nor the missionaries have left a record of their attitude in detail, their lines of thinking may readily be conjectured. The Ausschuss was constantly faced with heavy financial demands, and was never sure of its resources. It came to feel that the farm was a gamble at best, which considerably increased expenditures and demanded a large part of the time of the missionaries at the very season when travel with the Indians was most readily possible. If the farm were given up expenses should decline and the missionaries might depend on the Indians for support while traveling with them over the greater part of the year. Results might be gained from more intensive work among the Indians which should increase contributions, which in turn should make it possible to support the missionaries from supplies bought locally during the winter months without the heavy expense involved in supply trains.

---

[82] It seems most unlikely that so important a change in policy, which was publicized in the K. B. was not at once communicated to the missionaries. In any case, Kessler must have been informed of it. Yet immediately after his arrival, he wrote back reporting on the farm and on the lack of irrigation works, which he considered indispensable, and gave the purpose of going ahead as a decision of the group, K. B. IV, 6, 47-8. A report on the season's results was given by Krebs, Ibid., 10, 74-5, and Missionsblatt, 1861, 22, 174. They had spent six weeks building a dam seventy feet wide and nine feet high of earth, faced with stone. But water seeped through it and since the flow had greatly diminished the reservoir did not rise sufficiently high for irrigation purposes. They planned to fill in another foot of earth and then to face it with stone again.

---

[83] Deindoerfer who was chairman of the mission committee and also editor of the *Synodalbericht*, (see letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Waucoma, March 24, 1862, in I. S. D.) seems to have prepared a report for it, but it was not included for lack of space, *Synodalbericht*, 1861, 38. *Chronik*, 53-4, reports the action described. It will be remembered that the convention of 1860 had postponed action in regard to replacement of the mission committee. That may have been done in the hope that the *Centralverein* could be induced to assume the unwelcome responsibility. S. Fritschel reported, however, that the *Verein* supported missions but did not direct them. Since the *Ausschuss* consisted of the three seminary men and Deindoerfer and could meet conveniently and frequently it may have seemed logical to place it in charge. Deindoerfer and S. Fritschel had been members of the committee and G. Fritschel seems to have taken his brother's place during the long European visit and no doubt Grossmann as president had been in close touch; consequently the change was not so very great, especially since Klindworth remained treasurer for missions. See the letter cited above. The *Ausschuss* soon adopted a division of duties; S. Fritschel was to be in charge of correspondence with the *Centralverein* and others whose support he won in Germany, G. Fritschel of that with the *Gesellschaft*, and Deindoerfer of that with the missionaries, and was also to handle reports in the *K. B.* and to conventions of synod, *Protokollbuch*, *Ausschuss* Minutes, November 5, 1861.

[84] At the outset, the *Ausschuss* dealt with a request of Seyler for clarification of the duties of mission deacons. It replied that they were assistants to missionaries in the school and in the instruction of adults, *Ibid*., for

---

September 30, 1861. Chronik, 47, adds that the title deacon was abolished and Missionsgehilfe substituted, because the latter term was in more common usage. Kessler had written a letter which the Ausschuss regarded as being couched in offensive terms. He wished to retain the farm, and felt that a supply train was advisable, no doubt because of high costs at Deer Creek, and complained that the missionaries had not received reports of the convention, nor information on finances available. Besides all the men in the field wished to marry. In reply the Ausschuss resolved to have the missionaries elect a head themselves and to let them use their own judgment about the farm, but at their own responsibility. They were to be informed about the funds available and to be permitted to get a train of supplies if they sufficed, no amount was stated, but they were told that no appeal to the Centralverein could be made for the purpose. They might marry if they wished, but the Ausschuss could see no way of supporting a doubled personnel, loc. cit., Ausschuss Minutes, April 28, 1862.

The missionaries on the other hand doubted whether real economies could result from living with the Indians. They expected gifts during journeys and a return of hospitality at the station as generous as that which they provided in their own improvident way of life. To the missionaries it was therefore of the utmost importance that the necessary investment be provided to make the farm a success, so that provisions might be supplied by it in abundance. Until that goal could be reached, the cost of living would be high. Since goods and provisions could be bought far more cheaply in the settled areas, supply trains bringing them in in quantity were an economy, despite the heavy cost of the moment.

The problems involved in this dispute continued to plague the mission throughout its existence. In 1862 the Ausschuss permitted the missionaries to do what they thought best about the farm on their own responsibility.[85] In the next year it was decided once more to abandon farming as unprofitable, but emphasis on stock-raising might be substituted, and to that end, Beck was to be made station manager and paid a salary.[86] However, after personal consultation with a missionary who had returned for supplies, a measure of discretion was granted to the personnel in the field in regard to economic enterprise, provided that it did not interfere with missionary work and did not exceed the means available.[87] Later in 1863 the Ausschuss resolved to petition the government for a grant of land for the mission, but whether this was intended for grazing or for farming purposes was not specified.[88] Agricultural enterprise thus was never wholly dropped, but it does not seem ever to have made the return expected by the missionaries.

---

[85] The source is given in the preceding footnote. There is no information on the farming operations of the year 1862. But since the mission had to be abandoned for a while, farming operations may have suffered. If there had been a noteworthy yield, that would no doubt have been reported.

[86] Ibid., Ausschuss Minutes, January 23; February 4, 1863. Gardening was to be permitted. Chronik, 65, explains that experience of several years had shown that expenses of farming far exceeded the income. Locusts were apt to devour what little could be grown.

---

[87] Kessler was seeking means at the time for a supply train. A special session of the Ausschuss was devoted entirely to mission problems. Kessler, who had apologized for the offense he had given, heard criticism that the missionaries appeared determined to cling to colonization in opposition to the policy of the Ausschuss. He was told that the men in the field could not be permitted to run the mission independently and according to their own ideas. The synod had placed them under the direction of the Ausschuss, which was responsible for operating the mission in conformity with the expectations of the synod. The relations of the missionaries to the Ausschuss were somewhat analogous to those of Ausschuss and pastors of congregations, but not entirely, because the synod paid their salaries. Directions were then given that the mission must be kept in continuous operation and that to that end at least half of the missionaries should be away from the station and among the Indians at all times. Expenses must be kept within the means available and debts could not be contracted without express permission from the Ausschuss. Within these limits finally, the missionaries were conceded the right to do what they could to carry out ideas considered right and good by them. Loc. cit., Ausschuss Minutes, February 12, 1863; Chronik, 66.

[88] Ausschuss Minutes, November 4, 1863. The sources, cited in footnote 72 indicate that the mission land had been occupied on the authority of Major Twiss, who was then Indian agent, but was no longer so in 1863.

Missionary endeavors had proceeded in the meantime without producing great results. The journey undertaken by Kessler and Flachenecker in August 1861 lasted about a month and was devoted chiefly to language studies. Though considerable hardship was experienced, the missionaries were able to endure it readily and to establish a secure friendship with the Cheyenne. They withdrew, however, when they were asked to join a war party.[89] During most of the rest of the year all missionaries were at the station, trying vainly to induce

---

[89] The journey is reported K. B. V, 1, 7-8, and 3, 17-20. It went to the Powder River and the Indians talked freely of Braeuninger, seeming to be fully familiar with the details and condemning his murder. They were, however, hostile to the Crows and once reported traces of them. Hunting was bad at first and the missionaries found that during the period of privation they were expected to share their supplies not only with their hosts, but generally. They described a sweat bath ceremony which was medicine for better hunting. After a time game became plentiful and there was no more hunger. They were induced to leave not only by the invitation to join a war party, but also by rumors of a withdrawal of their companions from Deer Creek, and besides felt that they had learned most of the words in common use. The rumor was due to the fact that a new Indian agent had replaced Twiss, who under pretenses of great friendliness, tried to induce the missionaries to remove to Fort Laramie, where he had his headquarters. The missionaries soon found him dishonest and remained at Deer Creek, since there are later references to Twiss, he apparently also remained. The report also described the typical Indian social system with males idling in camp and women working hard, and emphasized the immorality prevalent. Part of the journey is also reported in Missionsblatt 1861, 24, 184-9, where the loss of some horses at the very start is noted. The report is Kessler's diary and is continued in subsequent issues not available to the writer. In another report, K. B. V, 8, 61-2, Kessler dealt entirely with the improvidence of the Indians and their generous hospitality in times of plenty, and with their friendliness due to which their guests always received the place of honor and the best of everything. He stressed that they expected similar treatment and during the scarcity complained of the scantiness of the supplies of their guests.

Indian families to stay with them. In December Krebs, Flachenecker and Seyler again set out on a journey which lasted about two months. They reported the Indians preoccupied with dances and at such times indifferent, not only to approaches from the missionaries, but even to hunting, until necessity finally forced a cessation of the ceremonies. More trouble ensued when a traveling trader supplied the band with whiskey. Their admonitions do not seem to have achieved much more than to incur the enmity of the trader, to which the Indians, however, remained indifferent. They were able by this time to enter into religious discussions with the Indians, refuting their legends and telling them the Christmas story in their language.[90]

During this time he bought a barrel of flour for them from a trader and also made an agreement to furnish another to his host. It seems probable that this report was written to correct the economy notions of the Ausschuss.

[90] The attempts to work with Indians at Deer Creek are in the report in K. B. V, 3, just cited. The winter journey is described, 5, 36-9 and 6, 45-6. The Christmas story in the Cheyenne language is printed, 39. Krebs undoubtedly was able to handle the language better than Kessler, who had just arrived. Even though this was his first journey, he had been trying to learn Cheyenne even during the winter of 1860-61, when the Crows were still the objective. He reported that Schmidt's Crow vocabulary was helpful for the purpose, IV, 4, 28. While the three men were on this trip, the destination of which is not clear, the two at the station had word that the Crows were on the Powder River. They were unable to leave the station and felt that the missionary endeavor had now been transferred to the Cheyennes. Deindoerfer in bringing the report, noted that the Ausschuss did not wish to have the Crows forgotten on this account, V, 3, 20.

In 1862, grave Indian disturbances occurred, especially among the Sioux. There were lesser disturbances in the Deer Creek region and the mail services were suspended over the Oregon Trail. For a time the missionaries retired to Fort Laramie during this scare and Kessler and Seyler returned to Iowa in order to bring out a supply train. The other three men returned to Deer Creek and found that no great damage had been done to their station. When the great Sioux outbreak in Minnesota occurred later in the season, the men at Wartburg had occasion to see troups of refugees and heard the most alarming rumors to the effect that the entire frontier was aflame. Since the mail service had not been restored, they were greatly worried over the safety of the missionaries who had returned to Deer Creek, but these had had no difficulty and had been able to resume their work with their Indians.[91]

---

[91] There is a gap in the reports in the *K. B.* which extend over the latter half of 1862 and the first months of 1863. In VI, 3, 17-19, a summary for this period is given, in which the temporary withdrawal is reported. The worries at home are reported in a letter from G. Fritschel, December 27, 1862, printed in *K. M.* 1863, 2, 13-16. It is not possible to state exactly why and when the withdrawal took place or how long it lasted. Nor is it certain that the decision of Kessler and Seyler to return to Iowa for supplies was connected with it. *Protokollbuch*, *Ausschuss* Minutes, April 28, 1862, reports the issues between the *Ausschuss* and the missionaries which have been discussed in footnote 84. There is no hint that the *Ausschuss* was then aware of a withdrawal from Deer Creek, but a qualified permission to organize a supply train was given, although no specific permission for missionaries to leave the field is indicated. According to G. Fritschel's cited letter, which does not mention a withdrawal at all, Kessler and Seyler had returned to Iowa and the other men were at Deer Creek when the Sioux outbreak in Minnesota occurred in August. This checks with a report from Krebs which notes a journey with the Indians, August 22-October 25, 1862, *K. M.* 1863, 8, 57. Since the *Ausschuss* was not informed of the return to the station

The return of Kessler and Seyler, though unauthorized, provided an opportunity for personal discussion of colonization and other problems and led to the arrangements in this regard which have been noted. Their request for a supply train was financially embarrassing and could not be granted at once. Seyler in consequence reentered the seminary and did not return to the mission the next year, Kessler was delayed until the following spring. Appeals for funds were again made to Germany and resulted favorably.[92] Student Matter

---

until September 29, Chronik, 64, Krebs may have left soon after the return, but it is also possible that news of the return was long delayed in the uncertain mail of that year. It seems probable that the withdrawal occurred in the early summer, but it may have taken place in the spring. If so, the return of Kessler and Seyler may have been prompted by a lack of any prospect of harvests from unplanted land, which would have made a supply train seem absolutely necessary. But since a garden was planted as will appear below, this hardly seems likely. Kessler and Seyler may have seized upon the implied promise of a supply train and have welcomed the opportunity for a personal discussion of the other difficulties. They may also have left before the withdrawal occurred, if the results of the discussion on April 28 were promptly communicated to them and if the withdrawal, as seems likely, did not last long. Kessler may have remained head of the mission, K. M. 1863, 7, 50, so lists him, but since Seyler is also still listed as deacon, the relevant facts may simply not have been reported to Germany.

[92] Chronik, 58, notes that it was impossible to furnish the supply train during 1862, though the Ausschuss was favorable, and the readmission of Seyler to the seminary, 63. It notes a request to the Centralverein of an especially generous grant for the train. Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, July 30-31, 1862, indicates that the estimated cost was $1,600. Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 62, states the final cost ran over $2,000 because of high wartime prices. Chronik, 67, merely says that three wagons left with equipment costing about $2,000. Ausschuss Minutes, January 23, 1863, noted that a non-committal reply had come from the Centralverein and that the cost must be kept within the means available, while those of March 14, 1863, authorized a loan of $400 for the train as within the probable subsidy to be expected from the Central-

was designated to take Seyler's place as Kessler's companion. Kessler had married during the interval and took along his wife, as well as Beck's fiancee. In April 1863 the train departed and arrived safely in July at Deer Creek.[93] It consisted of two or three wagons with so generous an amount of supplies that the men at the station were pleasantly surprised, and of livestock for the mission herd. The travellers

---

verein. Chronik, 65, indicates that the Verein had promised to furnish funds according to its best abilities, but that they would not arrive until April or after. Ausschuss Minutes, July 21, 22, 1863, note the receipt of $900 from the Centralverein and provided for the repayment of advances made by S. Fritschel. It may be noted that it was decided at the same time that since the Indian mission had benefited greatly from Fritschel's visit in Europe, $100 from the next subsidy should be used for debt retirement in Germany as its contribution to the cost of that visit. See also Chronik, 68.

[93] Matter's selection is discussed in Ausschuss Minutes, January 27 and February 12, 1862. He had taken his examinations, but the Ausschuss felt that he had characteristics which made it inadvisable to grant him the full status of missionary. He was not ordained. K. B. VI, 6, 42, notes the departure with the two brides. A brother of Beck also went along, but apparently only to help during the trip. Arrival is reported 12, 92, a cow was lost enroute. The question of brides was discussed in the Ausschuss again after word of Kessler's marriage was received and it was decided to inform the others that the mission could not support married men, Minutes, February 4, 1863. Nothing was said of Beck's bride, but the minutes of November 4, 1863, record a resolution to buy a wedding gift for Beck. Apparently the unauthorized return of Kessler and Beck had again stirred resentment, for a resolution was passed that in the future no missionary might return without permission, Minutes, February 4. It was also at this time that a definite rule was made that two missionaries should always be traveling, Minutes, January 23, 1863.

on their part were surprised by the excellent condition in which they found the mission garden, with a fine stand of a variety of vegetables and of corn.[94]

After the winter journey early in 1862, mission travel seems to have ceased for a while and its resumption was no doubt impeded by the brief withdrawal from Deer Creek. The missionaries seem to have made arrangements during this time to take an Indian family into the station and to have sought permission to concentrate on learning the language from them. They were asked, however, not to cease traveling entirely, because travel reports were needed to maintain the interest of friends and supporters of the mission.[95] In August 1862, after the return to Deer Creek, Krebs alone went on a journey with some Cheyenne, who travelled with a larger band of Arapaho. He was with them two months and reached a large encampment of the Cheyenne, for which the band was searching, only at the end of his stay. He was still bent on learning the language, but the small number of the Cheyenne made progress difficult. As best he could he warned them against drinking and gambling, to which his host was particularly addicted, and tried working with the sick, but could not report outstanding success. He did, however, although only with difficulty, win the confidence of the Arapaho. The praise of the Cheyenne helped in part, but medical advice which seems to have consisted chiefly of dietary suggestions, caused by the gluttony of the Indians, was the chief factor. The earlier suspicious attitude of the Arapaho may have been due to a fear that the missionaries were gold-seekers, scouts for a wave of adventurers. Krebs mentioned that traders had circulated rumors that the missionaries were self-seekers and surmised that distrust resulted. The Arapaho declared themselves ready now to let missionaries travel with them also. Krebs doubted whether it was advisable to start a missionary undertaking with a second tribe at once, but felt that the friendship of the Arapaho was a distinct gain, because Deer Creek was located on their tribal territory. Shortly after their arrival in the large camp, Krebs' host escorted him back to Deer Creek, in order to take back Flachenecker, who left at once late in October.[96]

---

[94] K. M. 1863, 10, 79. The mention of a garden seems to indicate that no attempt had been made to farm in 1863. Since corn is mentioned, the garden may have been of considerable size. The herd numbered thirty-nine head, and seems to have been considerably augmented by the train. This source refers to two wagons, while Chronik, 67, mentions three. One seems to have been used chiefly for travel and personal equipment. See an interesting account of the journey of the supply train by Matter, K. M. 1864, in all of 8 and 9, 10, 70-75.

[95] Chronik, 57.

---

[96] Krebs' trip is reported K. B. VI, 3, 17-19 and 4, 25-6. More extended sections of his report are in K. M. 1863, 8, 9, 10. K. M. in turn states that a complete report was printed in Missionsblatt, 1863, 10-16, but this was not available to the writer. The journey went toward the Powder River, but the location of the large camp is not given, although either it or the party with Krebs had been on the Big Horn. Krebs mentioned that since then the government had begun to enforce prohibition of the liquor trade with the Indians strictly and had punished various traders. It was hard to make an impression on his host in regard to gambling, because

No detailed report on Flachenecker's journey can be given, but it lasted some six weeks and seems to have initiated the adoption by the missionaries of an Indian boy. A mother died, while he was with the Indians. It is not clear whether he offered to take the children, of whom there were several, but they were taken by a sister and that family early in 1863 came to Deer Creek and agreed to give the missionaries two of the children. The father then came also and hesitated long, but finally agreed to give one of them, a boy, eight years old, who was willing to stay. About a month later, a second boy was adopted, who liked to associate with the other one, and whose foster parents were ready to leave him with

---

he was utterly indifferent to heavy losses and could not grasp the argument that it was wrong, though other Indians could see the point. Difficulty with the language made all religious discussion hard. The Arapaho in the end offered to take Krebs to the gold fields if he would keep the secret. The Ausschuss resolved to commend Krebs for this trip, but asked him not to consider the language his main objective or so to present it in his reports, but instead to emphasize the preaching of the gospel within the limits in which it was now possible, Chronik, 65; Ausschuss Minutes, January 23, 1863. The commendation may have been in compensation for a request recorded in the Minutes of September 29, when news of the return to Deer Creek had been received, that the missionaries should make opportunities rather than wait for them. Krebs' report indicated that if he had waited a little longer he would have had an opportunity to go directly from Deer Creek to the camp which he sought so long. At first he regretted his choice because he was with such a small number of Cheyenne, but the friendship of the Arapaho in the end compensated for that. It may also have been given, however, because Krebs had been almost constantly ill on the journey, due to cold weather and bad water, and at one time, when an attack was feared, had been considered in grave danger by the Indians, who rated him as defenseless, like their women. It may be of interest to note that in regard to the gluttony charge against the Indians, Krebs wrote that during two months, fourteen to sixteen people in his tent consumed seven buffalo, five antelope and an elk.

the missionaries.[97] Krebs took charge of the education of the boys and organized a school for the purpose. It seems that no further missionary journeys were made until after the arrival of the train in July 1863, perhaps partly because of the school, but also because supplies and provisions were lacking and the missionaries suffering actual want.[98]

The education of the Indian children thereafter became one of the major tasks of the mission. For a brief time a blind Indian gave them four additional children, two girls and two boys, but he took them back after a short time. In the summer, a third boy was received, however, who remained with the missionaries.[99] Krebs remained in chief charge of the children and did little traveling thereafter. Discipline was a great problem, since the children knew nothing of self-discipline and punishments might induce them to run away or the parents to take them away. One of them particularly liked to sneak away and made forbidden visits at white homes and to lie about it. Admonitions and house arrest were tried and after warnings, spanking was finally resorted to. Gradually the boys responded to these methods, although in different degrees and became warmly attached to Krebs. Instructions were given them, reading, writing, some German, Biblical history and Luther's catechism, which Krebs translated into Cheyenne. Krebs himself learned a great deal of the native language from his pupils. Baptism of two of them was planned for Christmas 1863 but misbehavior on the part of one of the boys caused the missionaries to defer it in his case. After another Christmas Eve program, like that of 1859, the youngest boy was baptized on Christmas Day and given the name Frederick. The second baptism took place on Easter Day, 1864.[100]

---

[97] A report in K. B. VI, 6, 41, tells of the adoption of the first boy, Muchsianoe or Brown Moccasin, while that of the second, Ekois or Little Bone is mentioned in K. B. VI, 12, 92, and, with the statement that he came about a month later, and in K. M. 1864, 3, 21, where the names are given. Fuller information is in his obituary, K. M. 1866, 3, 9-10. The second boy was thirteen or fourteen years old. Flachenecker's trip was mentioned as lasting about six weeks in K. M. 1863, 7, 52, with the notice that no report had been received as yet. It may have been lost in the insecure mails.

[98] K. B. VI, 12, 92. A brief report by Deindoerfer states that little news came through, the mail even then running only to Fort Laramie. The missionaries had gotten into debt, a horse had been lost, and they had gone hungry and barefoot. Krebs hinted at this too, stating that the inhabitants of Deer Creek were hostile, because the Indian children had been forbidden to associate with them, because of their dissolute living, and because the missionaries had reported liquor trading with the Indians, K. M. 1864, 3, 20. He also reported that soldiers had shot some of the mission stock and stolen the meat, although this was after the train arrived and brought livestock.

[99] Krebs told the story of the four in great detail in K. M. 1864, 3, 17-19. They had been with the Indian wife of

---

a Deer Creek resident. After unpleasant incidents had occurred, the missionaries forbade visits and the woman, who wanted the girls particularly to sell them into marriage, induced the father to take them back. Stories were then circulated about mistreatment by the missionaries which aroused a great stir and nearly led to the loss of the other two as well. The third boy, Mistahemik, or Owl's Head was given by a traveling Cheyenne foster father, K. B. VI, 12, 94. The missionaries were to retain all the boys until they were twenty years old.

[100] There are two reports by Krebs on the Indians, one dated September 19, 1863, is in K. B. VI, 12, 93, 94. The other, dated December 12, 1863, is in K. M. 1864, 2, 3, 12-23. Because of the dislike of the Indians for corporal punishment, Krebs hesitated long before resorting to spanking. When he

By the end of 1863 the mission station had been considerably improved. The original cabin had become a warehouse and a smaller one had been built onto it, where Flachenecker and Matter lived. Kessler had his own house, which also served as church. Another house was inhabited by Krebs and the Indian boys and served as school and also as dining room. Beck had a house of his own also, and there was another building which served as kitchen. The missionaries also had plans for erecting a church. They had full services every Sunday morning and when all missionaries were present also in the afternoon, the men alternating in preaching. On Sunday evening they had a Bible class and on Friday evenings, services with sermons on the catechism. Devotions were held daily after every meal, except breakfast, and to begin and end the day and followed definite patterns. The Indian boys were present on all these occasions. They had learned the Lord's Prayer in both languages and the missionaries were planning on translating prayers and Scriptures lessons into Cheyenne

---

did, the boys showed no resentment, but their relatives were excited by exaggerated reports. The baptism was reported by Kessler in K. B. VII, 5, 37-8, and by Krebs in K. M. 1864, 6, 41-6. At the Christmas Eve celebration there was again a tree, and the boys among other things received gifts which represented their Indian names. They were tremendously impressed, The baptismal ceremony followed Loehe's Agende, but was almost entirely in Cheyenne. The boy was named Friedrich, Sigmund, Christoph after his sponsors F. Bauer, S. Fritschel and Ch. Kessler. Following the K. M. report on p. 46 there is a brief letter in German by him to Bauer. The boy had dictated the contents to Krebs in his language, Krebs had translated it, and the boy had then copied the translation. The translation of the catechism into Cheyenne was reported, K. B. VII, 3, 17, and the second baptism that of Paulus, 9, 65-67.

for devotional purposes and had already made a beginning of writing hymns in that language.[101]

Indian disturbances during 1863 do not seem to have interfered with the mission, although reports of them caused worry to the authorities at home, and though friendly Indians suggested to the missionaries that they ought to withdraw.[102] The arrival of the supply train of 1863 enabled the missionaries to prosecute their work vigorously. By the beginning of 1864, however, they stood in need of replenishment of supplies and also asked for two additional missionaries. Although as usual means were inadequate, the Ausschuss gave permission to make a trip to Omaha for the purchases and Matter made such a journey. A considerable debt resulted, but aid from the Centralverein made it possible to extinguish it. Two missionaries were not available, but Seyler was commissioned to go out again.[103]

---

[101] K. M. 1864, 6, 44-5. They found that the Indians liked to sing and hoped to use these hymns while traveling also. They noted that it was difficult to keep their buildings free from vermin. Their meals were eaten in common.

[102] K. M. 1863, 7, 53, mentions reports of depredations in the vicinity of Deer Creek. In 1865, 2, 12, Krebs does not mention 1863 especially, but states that every spring of their stay brought threats and that friendly Indians had warned them repeatedly, particularly in 1862.

[103] Chronik, 71, which also gives the requested amount for the supplies as $1,200. Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, February 15, 1864, also reports the facts and notes that not that much money was available. S. Fritschel and the missionaries themselves were to write to the Centralverein. The Minutes of July 8, 1864, note that Matter had contracted debts of $761 at Plattsmouth, but that fortunately $800 had arrived to cover them. The Ausschuss issued a reprimand, however, for the debt-making. Since Chronik notes, that what was in the treasury was used in addition to the German remittance, something like the full amount may have been spent.

Missionary journeys were resumed immediately after the arrival of the train of 1863, Flachenecker and Matter going on a visit to a large Cheyenne camp in present day Montana. Most of the warriors were away on an expedition against the Crows and after their return they were unreceptive, particularly when Flachenecker undertook to chide them for their warlike activities. The missionaries also found that the Sioux were taking a hostile attitude toward the Cheyenne, because the latter associated with themselves, whom the Sioux regarded as spies or treasure-seekers.[104] Flachenecker undertook another visit to a Cheyenne camp in the Powder River region in December and January, being driven back to Deer Creek in January by the extremely cold weather. He preached a Christmas sermon to the Indians on this occasion and his report in accord with Ausschuss instructions stressed the missionary element in numerous conversations held with the Indians, but he could not report outstanding results.[105]

---

[104] The time of the trip cannot be stated exactly. Its beginning is noted as soon after the train arrived, in K. B. VI, 12, 92, and in VII, 3, 17-18 a report on it is given under date of November 15, 1863. The destination is given in Matter, Im Dienste der Indianermission, which is in private hands, but a translation of which forms an appendix to E. G. Fritschel's thesis. The Ausschuss does not seem to have been aware of the straits of the mission, which prevented journeys until after the train had arrived. Its minutes, September 16, 1863, contain an impatient notice that it seemed that missionaries would not report on missionary activities at all during the year. Notice was taken that the Centralverein had scarcely referred to the Indian mission at all in a recent anniversary celebration. The missionaries were to be informed that no support could be expected unless reports on their work were forthcoming.

[105] K. B. VII, 33-5. Flachenecker seems to have been alone on this occasion. He had not fully mastered the language since his earlier report still mentions language studies and

Krebs and Matter undertook a journey early in 1864 which took them into the northern reaches of Wyoming. Again they visited an encampment of the Cheyenne, some Sioux were also present and it appears that Matter was learning the language of the latter. Krebs was easily the most skilled of the missionaries in the language of the Cheyenne and devoted his time exclusively to religious discussion and to preaching. He reported that the Indians were now beginning to understand why the missionaries were traveling with them. Their attitude varied, some would not come to hear him, others would listen attentively and applaud and some of them would enter into long discussions with him, but few if any responded to his admonitions. When impressed, they would fall silent and break off the conversation. Some of them became critical, of the missionaries and began to vilify them behind their backs. Krebs noted that this was especially true of those who visited the station. They tried to induce the Indian boys to reject the teachings of the missionaries and the father of the boy first to be baptized sought to induce him to return to the tribe.[106]

---

the delight which the Indians took in hearing the record of what they had told the missionaries read back to them, after the missionaries took it down. The missionaries at least at times also tried to instruct Indian children in writing while in camp, K. B. V, 6, 39.

[106] This journey is reported in K. B. VII, 6, 43-5, and in K. M. 1864, 7, 49-53 and 9, 65-70. In addition 6, 47-8, contains excerpts from a letter by Matter, which described the activities of a Sunday on the trip. He wrote that Krebs preached with a power and intensity in the Indian language which exceeded those of any sermon Matter had ever heard him preach in German. Krebs reported that the father of the bap-

Matter and Flachenecker made another journey with the Cheyenne through the Black Hills and it is possible that there were still others, of which no record was found.[107] At the station too the missionaries on duty there continued to try to reach the Indians in personal discussions and through sermons. The reactions obtained were much the same as those on the journeys. The missionaries had to confess that it was difficult to convert adult Indians. Attempts to induce them to leave other children with the missionaries or at least to send children to the school at the station while the parents were in the vicinity, also failed. There is no indication,

---

tized boy had told the latter under seal of secrecy that after one more war party he would take the boy away and he would shoot Krebs if he should beat the boy during the interval. This was done after quietly attending the services and participating in the activities of the mission station for several days without saying a word to the missionaries. The boy did not wish to leave, and told Krebs what his father had said to him. Traveling must have been difficult for Krebs for he was subject to fainting spells. In contrast to earlier reports of Sioux hostility, Krebs reported that a Sioux had guided them to the Cheyenne camp and that a small Sioux camp gave them hospitality on the way, and also noted the presence of other Sioux from whom Matter was learning that language. The destination is again noted in Matter's record.

[107] Matter speaks of such a journey in his record, though he does not describe it in detail. He might have been with Flachenecker on the winter journey described, but that seems to have been made into the Powder River region. Not only does his own report sound as if he had been alone, but Krebs also makes it appear thus, K. M. 1864, 2, 14 and 3, 19-20, in which he indicates that the purpose of that trip was in part refutation of the rumors of mistreatment of the Indian boys. Since Kessler is not mentioned as having participated in any of the recorded trips, nor prominently in the station activities, it is possible that he may have gone on others of which no record has come to hand. There is also no further mention of the Arapaho in the records at hand and it is not impossible that an attempt may have been made to follow up the invitation which Krebs had won from them. In fact, since Matter was ob-

however, that the missionaries were losing heart. They seem to have felt that now when the Indians were beginning to understand their purpose, the time had come for the patient perseverance that would in the end lead to results. There is no hint of discouragement or of thoughts of abandoning the mission.[108]

The days of the mission were now numbered, however. Grave Indian disturbances had been brewing during most of the time that the mission had existed. If preliminary outbreaks had interfered with it, the storm broke in 1864 which was to compel its abandonment. Through the winter and spring of that year the work proceeded and in the early summer a supply train seems to have reached the station, though perhaps not without difficulty. But by summer, outrages against travellers began to be reported. The friendly Cheyenne according to the missionaries were drawn into the warfare only after hesitation and did not even then turn against the mission. These Indians warned the missionaries that a war of extermination was getting under way which would be carried on until either the whites or the Indians were driven out of the territory entirely. They

---

viously trying to approach the Sioux, it seems likely that some attempt may have been made to reach the Arapaho.

[108] A report by Krebs in K. B. VII, 9, 65-7, deals with missionary work at the station and Krebs' report in K. M. cited in footnote 106 also refers to it. The K. B. report mentions rumors of impending difficulties on the Powder River route to the gold region, but does not hint of discouragement or abandonment.

advised the missionaries to withdraw with the Indian boys to territory where there were no Indians. After the war had ended they should return and the Cheyenne, if they were in possession of the territory, would admit them and them only. After the Southern Cheyenne, with whom the missionaries had never had contact had become involved in the hostilities the Northern Cheyenne withdrew from the Deer Creek vicinity for fear of retaliation against them by the military. Missionary activities thus came to a complete standstill. As outrages increased and the Indians, particularly the Sioux grew bolder, the white inhabitants of Deer Creek fled. Only a small military post of some thirty men on the Platte about five miles away, remained. The missionaries withdrew to this post at one time in the summer when friendly Cheyenne managed to send them a warning that a Sioux band intended to attack them within a few days. A band did approach the station, but did not destroy it, apparently because soldiers were scouting in the vicinity. The missionaries then returned, but in a few weeks were forced to withdraw a second time, when a second similar episode occurred. They then took shelter in an abandoned house near the station, where they remained during August and September, hoping for the end of the hostilities.[109]

---

[109] This paragraph is based chiefly on an undated letter of Krebs, filed in the Chronik under the year 1867, which bears a notation in Deindoerfer's writing that it was written at the request of the chronicler. It deals with the withdrawal of 1864 and that of 1867 and will hereafter be cited as Krebs' letter. There is also an account by Krebs in K. M. 1865, 2, 11-16.

The earlier reports sent home by the missionaries were either not alarming or were slow in reaching the authorities at home. The convention of 1864 which met late in August through the first days of September does not seem to have been aware of an impending suspension of the mission. In the course of extensive constitutional changes, the Ausschuss was abolished and a new mission committee elected to take charge of direction. The synod directed the committee to supply the missionaries with relevant publications and to send them a letter of commendation and encouragement in the name of synod, and even instructed it to give consideration to the publication of history of the mission.[110]

A report K. B. VII, 10, 79, adds or alters a few details. On the occasion of the first withdrawal Twiss seems still to have been present and the missionaries seem to have taken refuge with him, rather than at the military station. Bissonette also seems to have remained at Deer Creek. Matter and Seyler are reported to have been at Fort Laramie when the trouble first broke. It may be that Matter was on his way back from the journey to Omaha or he may have gone to meet Seyler, who is not otherwise mentioned, but may have returned to the field at that time. Since the train is not mentioned this seems rather probable. They joined the group at Deer Creek later.

[110] List, Zusammenstellung, 1864, in I. S. D. and Chronik, 77. The latter noted that the committee was to work in collaboration with the president and to report to the synod. Its membership is given in List and also in the Synodalbericht of 1864 as Klindworth, Dietz, Schueller. It should be noted, however, that in a report on the convention, K. B. VII, 11, 84, a statement appears which indicates that the convention had heard that the missionaries were in imminent danger, because of Indian disturbances in their immediate vicinity and that they could not flee, because their horses had been stolen. The last clause would seem to indicate that the convention had heard rumors, rather than a report from the missionaries.

Immediately after the convention, however, reports arrived which indicated the perilous position of the missionaries, but reported that they would stay on until recalled. Klindworth at once sent a telegram ordering retirement, but followed it with a letter to Fort Laramie, directing that two of the men remain there.[111] The missionaries meanwhile had come to the conclusion themselves that withdrawal was necessary. Their safety was precarious because the garrison on the Platte was too small to withstand mass attacks and rumors continued to reach them that the Indians intended to wipe out the Deer Creek settlement. Besides this, the soldiers were hostile. They left late in September and reached Fort Laramie safely, where Matter and Flachenecker remained. The others made their way amidst hardships and peril to the Missouri, where they considered awaiting the end of hostilities. But refugees had so crowded accommodations and prices were so high that they continued their retreat to Iowa. Krebs there continued in the mission service, giving his time to the instruction of the Indian boys, of whom it was hoped that they might some day return to their tribe as missionaries. Matter and Flachenecker remained at Fort Laramie until late in December. There was no real safety there either, however, and little prospect of an early return, consequently late in the year, they also returned to Iowa.[112]

---

[111] K. B. IX, 8, 59-60. Chronik, 78, indicates that after the receipt of the alarming reports, synodical authorities were gravely concerned about the safety of the missionaries. There is no direct statement that Klindworth's directions were received and the text will indicate that the missionaries had independently decided on withdrawal, but the tone of the reports indicate they did not withdraw until directed to do so. The letter at Fort Laramie clearly was received.

During the next year the third Indian boy received baptism at Galena, but the hopes for the future of the boys were sadly reduced by the death of two of them. Only the youngest and first baptized, Frederick, survived.[113] When, however, in 1866 prospects of peace became brighter an attempt was made to resume the Indian mission. Some means for continuing the work were available and early in the year the mission committee began to consider personnel. Krebs, Matter and Flachenecker were designated, but funds sufficed for only two emissaries, and Flachenecker was eliminated.[114] The two men left with Frederick, the surviving Indian boy, for Fort Laramie in May 1866. They travelled in their own conveyance, but found that danger still existed and that military regulations slowed travel. After four months they arrived at Fort Cottonwood, near the present site of Maxwell, Nebraska, where they decided to stay and to await developments. For a time they secured quarters in the fort, but later occupied a house, some five miles away.[115] A weary period of waiting ensued through the winter. Krebs with Frederick was working on a Cheyenne grammar and dictionary and also on the translation of the Gospel according to St. Luke. Sioux occasionally visited them, but they saw no Cheyenne.[116] The missionaries sought to have missions among the Cheyenne and Arapaho assigned to them by the government and were keenly disappointed when the Cheyenne were assigned to the Catholic Church, but attempted to procure a reversal of this decision.[117]

---

[112] See the sources given in footnote 109, *K. M.* 1865, 3 and 4, also brings a letter from Flachenecker, Fort Laramie, December 7, 1865, which gives notice of the decision to withdraw from there and speaks of missionary contact with a Cheyenne in the military service there and of further linguistic studies during the stay. The missionaries had been compelled to leave part of their property at their station. When they returned to get it they found considerable damage which they attributed to soldiers. The return to Iowa with its hardships is described in a MS. by Krebs which is in private hands, but of which much is given in E. Fritschel's thesis. Matter's record *Ibid.* describes the return from Fort Laramie in December which was made rapidly on the top of an overcrowded stage coach which travelled day and night. The cited issue of *K. M.* also contains a letter from Schueller, pp. 19-22, which states that on their return in November Krebs and the Indian boys were given a room in the orphanage at Andrew and that Beck received temporary employment there, while Kessler was awaiting a call to a congregation. The obituaries cited in the next footnote indicate that Krebs and the boys later went to Wartburg.

[113] The baptism is noted *Chronik*, 78, which also records the two deaths, and *K. B.* IX, 8, 60. The boy was named Gottfried. The deaths are described at length and with much information on the boys, *K. B.* VII, 9, 66-8, for Gottfried who was the first to die, and IX, 1, 3-7 for Paulus and K. M. 1865, 10, 38-40 and 1866, 3, 9-10; 4, 13-14; 5, 19-20. Gottfried died August 2 and Paulus December 15, 1865. Both are buried in the cemetery at St. Sebald, where their graves are marked. Klindworth in letters to Grossmann, March 8 and April 2, 1865, in I. S. D. had doubted their qualifications for a missionary vocation and suggested other careers, also objecting to the devotion of Krebs' entire time to them. The boys died of tuberculosis and *Chronik* indicates that the change in their mode of life proved fatal.

---

[114] K. B. IX, 8, 59-60. Flachenecker fell into grave heresy and was unfrocked. A letter, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, January 6, 1866, in I. S. D. suggested a mission committee meeting and indicated disapproval of Matter because of his activities since his return and also inquired whether Beck was willing to return. It mentioned that means were available. Apparently the Centralverein now made regular appropriations for the cause. A letter, Bauer - G. Fritschel, Neuendettelsau, January 26, 1866, in I. S. D. notes that the budget for the Indian mission had been reduced, because of discouragement over the outlook.

[115] K. B. IX, 12, 92-6. Government regulations permitted only trains of thirty or more teams to travel in the west. Between forts they repeatedly violated this and went ahead, but were always delayed at the next fort. They had concluded that it would be difficult to reach Fort Laramie, but felt that at Fort Cottonwood they could reach the Indians. Housing was quite a problem, after they could no longer live in the fort, they lived with a family for a while and then moved into an unfinished house. Dates of the journey ran from mid-May to September. The report is dated September 28. Krebs' letter says it began May 13 and lasted about four months.

The outlook for peace, however, did not improve. The missionaries heard that the Cheyenne remained on the warpath and were now stubbornly insistent on continuing hostilities.

---

[116] Ibid. in the K. B. and X, 2, 9-10. The Sioux would not listen to preaching, but were greatly interested in Frederick, who spoke both German and English as well as his native tongue. They hoped that word of Frederick would spread among the Indians and attract the Cheyenne.

[117] Letters, Klindworth - Grossmann, August 22, 1866; January 3 and 11, 1867, in I. S. D. Krebs suggested an application to the government. It is not clear whether it was made, for Klindworth by that time had little hope for the mission. When Krebs later reported the assignment to the Catholics he urged sending Schueller who spoke English well to Washington to procure a reversal. Klindworth doubted whether Schueller had the right personality, but agreed and suggested that Dr. Passavant of the General Council be asked to accompany him. No outcome was reported. Pastor G. P. Krebs at Omaha, Nebraska, has a copy of a report sent to the mission committee by his father during the journey to Fort Cottonwood, at a time when he still hoped to reach Fort Laramie. From it it appears that Krebs had learned that the Indian superintendent for the western tribes was favorably disposed toward assigning Cheyenne, Arapaho and Sioux to Lutheran missions. He had tried to see the superintendent at Omaha, but had missed him and urged the mission committee to make application for the care of these tribes. Krebs indicated that some thought had been given to transfer of missionary endeavor to the Pawnees, but reported that this tribe had been assigned to the Methodist Church.

When the arrival of spring brought word of increasing outrages, Matter sent a pessimistic letter home and Klindworth recalled the men for the second time in April 1867. In May, they began a perilous journey and returned safely.[118] At its convention in 1867 the synod resolved to terminate the mission for the present, but provided for the retention of a mission committee. Krebs was to remain at the disposition of the mission and to retain care of Frederick, for whom moneys received for the mission were to be used. A history of the mission was to be prepared and published.[119]

It was never possible to reopen the Indian mission. Some gifts continued to be received and a fund was maintained for many years. In the next decade after peace had been restored, there were some indications of a revival of interest in the Crows. Suggestions resulted that this work should be resumed, perhaps in cooperation with other Lutheran churches interested in Indian missions. Nothing tangible resulted, however. In 1888 the fund was turned back to the *Gesellschaft* for its newly organized mission in New Guinea. This action constituted the final abandonment of an Indian mission, and the synod thereafter gave increasing support to the new project which in time was to become its own.[120]

---

[118] Krebs' letter and fragment of a letter from Matter, undated, of which a type copy is in I. S. D. Krebs says that they learned later that the Cheyenne at that time were most stubborn in resistance. Matter merely mentions a report from Sioux sources that the Cheyenne had gone to the mountains and writes of Sioux outrages. It appears from this fragment, that Matter was more pessimistic than Krebs and had been ready to turn back at Fort Kearney in 1866. The recall is noted in letters, Klindworth - Grossmann, April 24 and May 11, 1867, in I. S. D. The former mentions a telegram sent in April, "Stop your work. Sell your things and return." The second says that the telegram did not reach the men, but that it was followed by a letter. It is clear from this correspondence that Matter's letter was the occasion for the recall, but also that Klindworth had little hope for success by that time.

[119] List, Zusammenstellung, 1867. Frederick in later life disappointed the synod, when in adult life he was separated from Krebs. He died repentant, however, still in young manhood, Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 65. If a history of the mission was published at that time, the writer has not been able to find it. G. Fritschel, however, in 1870 published Geschichte

In the Indian mission project the Iowa Synod drifted into an undertaking which proved to be far beyond its resources. The project originated at a time when the founders of synod were thinking of a repetition of the Michigan undertakings in

---

der christlichen Missionen unter den Indianern Nordamerikas im 17 und 18. Jahrundert. It does not deal with the Iowa mission or any of the nineteenth century Indian missions, but may have been the result of this resolution. There are various references to its publication in the I. S. D.

[120] An article in *K. M.* VII, 6, 43-5 argued that it had been a mistake to transfer activities from the Crows to the Cheyenne. It held that the Crow region had seen little disturbance during the period of the Indian wars, implying without regard to the question of communications, that it could have been maintained. It maintained that the Crows were still friendly and hoped that some Lutheran body would resume the work among them, before it was too late. Pastor Foelsch in *K. B.* XIX, 16, 121-2, called attention to peace terms which in the future would protect the Crows from hostile tribes and appealed to the synod to resume the work at once. *Ibid.*, 127-8, notice is taken of attempts of the Augustana and the Wisconsin synods to begin Indian missions. Scattered references in the I. S. D. indicate that there were negotiations with Wisconsin for the use of the fund. *Synodalbericht 1888*, 76, has the resolution to turn the fund then amounting to $1,257.88 over to the New Guinea mission, but S. Fritschel was to secure the consent of the *Centralverein* which had raised the fund. It must have been secured for *Synodalbericht 1890*, 93, contains a resolution designating half of synod's undesignated receipts

Iowa under the direction of Neuendettelsau. By the time of the organization of the synod, sufficient interest had been created to set missionary enterprises under way. The synod realized and stated its inability to conduct an Indian mission in 1855, but it countenanced and encouraged Schmidt's travels nevertheless. Schmidt's zeal eventually found an opening among the Crows. It is quite possible that an organization commanding great resources might have been able to carry out his plans and to establish a foothold which might have survived the long years of frontier disturbances, or if interrupted, might have been reestablished later. The synod, however, possessed neither the political influence required for securing a trading license, so vital to Schmidt's plans, nor the means to establish a colony or even a station in the remote area where the Crows lived. When this became clear, the synod became reluctant to assume responsibility for the mission, but allowed itself to be carried along and substituted the enterprise in the valley of the North Platte, which it could never establish securely and which succumbed to the Indian wars.

It seems clear that missionary enthusiasm rather than a calculated appraisal of the enterprise, its responsibilities and possibilities, were the motivating factor. A contributing

---

for foreign missions for the New Guinea mission thereafter. By 1904 a Neuendettelsau representative stated that receipts from the Iowa Synod for the New Guinea mission by that time exceeded all the amounts which the Gesellschaft had contributed to the synod.

factor to the failure was the fact that financial management was not a strong side of synod. No one seems to have thought of making a careful estimate of annual needs and of a plan for meeting them. From time to time when needs became pressing, urgent appeals were sent to Germany. German supporters who operated within budgets on a systematic basis had difficulty in meeting these appeals, though they usually managed to do so, but after vexatious and injurious delays.[121] The men who guided the mission were conscientious, even as the missionaries were zealous and self-sacrificing, but they were too greatly overburdened with other responsibilities to develop the talent for efficient management which the mission urgently required.

---

[121] A letter, Bauer - Deindoerfer, Neuendettelsau, January 26, 1862, in I. S. D. highlights the point. In 1861, he writes, when a financial emergency arose, instructions were sent to S. Fritschel, then in Europe, to ask for funds. Fritschel was then in Russia and could not do so. Then a direct appeal was made by letter. By the time it arrived the appropriations had been made for the year. Since there had then been no request at hand from the synod, no allocation had been made to it. When the appeal arrived there would have been no way of meeting it, if the treasurer had not in anticipation of just such an emergency held back an amount for its use. Bauer said that the Verein lacked neither the means nor the purpose to support the Indian mission. But requests for support must arrive before the end of April to receive consideration. They should be accompanied by an accounting and by specific estimates of needs for salaries, supplies, etc. If appeals for aid would come in this form and were not exaggerated, the synod could count on receiving what it requested, even if the amounts should run as high as 3,000-4,000 Gulden. Something like this may have been done thereafter, for considerable amounts were actually received from the Centralverein. But the difficulties which arose whenever the missionaries asked for a supply train indicate that the Ausschuss never got to the point where it could make a clear estimate in advance of annual needs. It should be kept in mind, however, that the burden which rested upon each individual member of the Ausschuss was extremely heavy. No doubt a separate mission committee whose members might have developed expertness in relation to the problems of the mission would have been a wiser arrangement. There is also some evidence that the habit of appealing both to the Gesellschaft and to the Centralverein, though it brought results, led to complications. Correspondenzblatt, XI, 4, 16, carried a notice informing members of the Gesellschaft that they were injuring its work, if with the best of purposes they designated most of their contributions for the Indian mission. It added that the

Centralverein supported the mission adequately. It is, however, doubtful whether the German supporters ever had an adequate understanding of the difficulties and problems which the mission faced.

CHAPTER X

CONSTITUTION: ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT 1854-1864

Constitutional growth proceeded slowly and by degrees through the first decade of the Iowa Synod. It will be remembered that adoption of a constitution had been postponed, at the organization meeting, pending advice to be solicited from fathers and friends. Not even officers had been elected. This measure was taken in 1855, when Grossmann was elected president and S. Fritschel, secretary.[1] In regard to a constitution matters did not proceed so rapidly. Two pastors had been instructed to work out a draft for the second convention of synod on basis of the advice received, but since none was given, the draft was not ready. It was resolved to wait another year and the task of working out a draft was assigned to the ministerial conference.[2] This assignment, however, was not carried out either and there is no record of the consideration of a constitution in 1856. In 1857 the ministerial conference worked out a draft, but the minutes were lost and its provisions cannot be given.[3] Thereafter there were occasional references to a constitution, but no written document was to come into existence during the next few years.

---

[1] *Chronik*, 10. It was done at the fourth regular session of the ministerial conference,"da die Conferenz aber noch die Synodalversammlung repraesentierte."

[2] *K. M.* 1856, 6 and 7, 47-8. Preparation of a draft was said to require much more time, than had been expected and so important a matter was not to be hurried. No reason is given for the failure of the German fathers to reply. In chapter VI attention has been called to the solicitation of advice from Buffalo and to its reply that it had no constitution.

If it took years to produce a written constitution, an unwritten one was slowly developing from the beginning. Mention has been made in an earlier chapter of the constitution for congregations in 1855 and of its revision in 1859 and 1860. In it synodical practice was fixed and definite measures were laid down for the realization of basic ideals. As early as the first ministerial conference in October 1854, through the elaboration of principles to govern establishment of congregations and of rules for the catechumenate steps were taken toward the drafting of this constitution and therewith also of establishing constitutional procedures for the synod.[4] Although the convention of 1855 failed to draw up a constitution, it did seat congregational delegates and laid down the principles on admission of congregations and pastors into the synod, which were to remain in effect throughout the decade.[5]

---

[3] Records for the convention of 1856 are scanty. The official minutes like those of all the early conventions are not extant and no report was printed, nor does K. M. have an account. Chronik describes it and its resolutions, but does not mention the constitution. Chronik, 17, records that the minutes of the pastoral conference of 1857, held in June were lost and the constitutional draft with it. It notes that nothing essential had been changed, merely some details fixed and that it was intended to be provisional, pending further study.

[4] Chronik, 7.

[5] Ibid., 11.

In another direction regulations of considerable significance resulted from a ministerial conference, which met in Dubuque October 30, 1854. The members of the synod, still all pastors, came together and resolved to hold such conferences regularly each third month thereafter. While the regulations adopted clearly show that the meeting was to have devotional character and serve purposes of study and discussion, they also provided that each member was to state at the opening session what he wished to have discussed and on basis of these suggestions the conference was to decide on an order of business.[6] This left latitude for matters of business and church government and the fact that the fourth such conference elected synodical officers indicates that during the first year at least, such ministerial conferences exercised functions scarcely to be distinguished from those of formal conventions of the synod.[7] A differentiation was introduced when the second convention admitted lay delegates. Thereafter synodical conventions were attended by both, while only pastors and teachers came to conferences. Even at conventions, however, ministerial conferences had separate sessions.[8] Such conferences were to exercise functions of church government through the first half of the decade and often to deal with matters of importance. Conventions met annually through 1856, but thereafter only biennially. In 1861 the synodical convention due the next year was summoned to hear S. Fritschel report on his visit to Europe, but it was not regarded as special synod, for the next one met at its regular time in 1864.

---

[6] Protokollbuch, Minutes Min. Conf., Dubuque, October 30, 1854. A constitution of sorts for the conferences was drawn up which provided for regular meetings on the first Wednesday and Thursday every third month, with a provision that the preceding conference was to set other dates, if these happened to be festival days. The place of meeting was to rotate and conferences were to open with services Tuesday evening or Wednesday morning. Members were to be the pastors and teachers of the synod and every pastor was to come prepared to deliver a sermon. The session on each day was to open with a public service and there were to be two additional liturgical services. In addition to the cited provisions about the order of business it was provided that discussions were to begin with the presentation of motions in writing. If there was time left after the order of business had been disposed of it was to be spent in exegetical discussion of the pastoral epistles. The local pastor was to preside and the secretaryship to rotate in alphabetical order.

---

[7] The relegation of exegetical discussions to the time left over, did not preclude other theoretical discussions. The following conference seems to have given most of its time to doctrinal discussion and controversy, Ibid., Minutes Min. Conf., Dubuque, December 7, 1854. These minutes are, however, incomplete. The first conference besides its own organization dealt with a synodical organ, preparatory work for the congregational constitution, and assignments of pastors to vacancies.

[8] This arrangement began in 1855 and continued for a number of years. In 1855 the synod or convention began on September 26 and ran through the forenoon of September 27. On September 24 a ministerial conference met for preliminary discussion of business with which the convention then dealt and after the convention had adjourned another conference met to dispose of matters, "die ihrer Natur nach allein durchs Ministerium eine Erledigung finden konnten." K. M. 1856, 6 and 7, 41-2, differentiation between the two later caused confusion and regulations were adopted which will be noted.

There began, however, to be a differentiation between conferences and general ministerial conferences after 1856. When the Wisconsin congregations were taken over from Buffalo early in that year, it became difficult for all pastors to attend a single conference. In the spring of that year there was a session of a western conference, which dealt with matters relating to its sphere, but also selected delegates to represent the synod at the convention of the Buffalo Synod. In the fall an eastern conference met, but only to hold a preliminary discussion session in regard to matters which were to come before the entire ministerium, at a general conference in connection with the convention of the synod which met a few days later.[9] The general conference heard the minutes of both local conferences and then wrestled with the question of jurisdiction. It decided that business naturally divided itself into matters of local and others of general interest and that the distinction would readily be apparent. There were henceforth to be two divisions of the ministerium, each with its own chairman and conference and each was to handle local affairs. Matters of general interest on the other hand were to be brought before general conferences of the entire ministerium. In a case where a rapid decision seemed desirable, the pastor who submitted it to the chairman might ask for a mail vote, or for a special session, in other cases business would be deferred to regularly scheduled sessions. Pastors might also submit problems with suggested solutions to the chairman and proceed with his consent.[10] This arrangement was then submitted to the convention of the synod, which provided for another general ministerial conference during 1857, while the next convention was to be held in 1858.[11]

---

[9] Chronik, 12, for the western conference, p. 13, for the eastern. The western also discussed arrangements for the coming convention and heard a report on Schmidt's arrival and the Indian mission to be opened, but no action on this project is reported. It met at Dubuque May 28, the eastern conference at Cottage Grove September 1-2, the convention at Dubuque September 8-12, preceded by a general pastoral conference September 4-5.

Clearly thus by 1856 the synod was facing problems of constitutional organization. During the first few years the number of pastors was so small that it was possible to meet and handle problems collectively. The ministerial conference thus served nearly all purposes. On the one hand it served to bring the men together for study, inspiration and maintenance of personal, brotherly contacts; on the other it provided an opportunity for the consideration of any and all problems, synodical policies, relations to other synods, pastoral assignments and transfers, questions of pastoral practice. The ministerium thus became the governing agency, synodical officers served only parliamentary functions, synodical conventions were conferences of the ministerium with the addition of lay representatives of the congregations. In 1856 numbers had not yet increased to a point rendering this system impracticable, but the membership had been dispersed with the result that frequent meetings were no longer convenient.

---

[10] Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, September 4-5, 1856. The minutes of the western conference in May had been presented to the recent session of the eastern conference. It seems probable that the discussion arose out of the fact that the western conference had handled matters of general interest. Grossmann was elected as chairman of the western and Deindoerfer of the eastern division. The conference also considered Grossmann chairman of the entire ministerium, but left it open whether that also made him president of the synod. The convention must have acknowledged or elected him, for he delivered a Synodalrede or presidential address both then and in 1858 at the next convention. Ibid., and Synodalbericht 1858, 1-7. If problems were to be settled with the consent of the chairman, he was to give them careful consideration in the light of the Scriptures and of the views of the ministerium, so as to be able to justify his decision before the latter.

[11] Chronik, 17.

The arrangements of 1856 were designed simply to make the necessary adjustments so that the existing system might continue to operate under changing conditions. No attempt was made to transfer functions of church government from the ministerium to a convention of synod representing both clergy and laity, or to clarify the distinctive functions of the latter institution. Its importance was diminished somewhat, by the provision for biennial instead of annual sessions and the problem involved was thus neatly straddled.[12] Neither was there as yet a clear-cut transfer of administrative duties from the ministerium to synodical officers. Transitional steps in this direction may, however, be recognized in the discretionary power conferred on the chairman.[13] By providing for more frequent sessions of the entire ministerium than

---

[12] There is no indication in the sources cited in the preceding footnotes, that this question was discussed. Nor is it clear that a definite substitution of biennial for annual sessions was resolved. It has been pointed out already, however, that this was the result. Since, as has been shown

---

in chapter VIII, congregations were not greatly interested in synodical meetings, it is not likely that there was opposition to the new arrangement. There was a rather good representation of laymen in attendance, however. St. Sebald, Dubuque, Clayton Center, Sherrill's Mount and Menominee were represented. These were all nearby and none of the Wisconsin congregations from a greater distance had sent a delegate, despite or perhaps because of the fact that three of them--Madison, Cottage Grove, and Lewistown--were admitted to membership on this occasion. It may be mentioned that the Dubuque delegate was Teacher Doerfler, who under the conference rules was entitled to sit with the ministerium. All pastors, nine in number, were present. Chronik, 13, 14. The clerical domination which the conference system made possible, was of course in harmony with the select group ideology of the synod, its early origin should be noted, for despite later constitutional changes it was to remain characteristic of the synod. A list of the synodical conventions held during the first decade may be appended:

1854	St. Sebald
1855	Dubuque
1856	Dubuque
1858	St. Sebald
1860	Madison
1861	St. Sebald
1864	St. Sebald

[13] It can be understood that under a system in which the collective ministerium handled all matters, no need for permanent officers had been felt during the first year. It will be remembered that conference offices were to be held in rotation and it is quite possible that the election of synodical officers in 1855 had occurred, because rotation proved inefficient. No reason for it is given. The grant of discretionary power as previously noted, was carefully qualified in 1856 and was apparently intended to extend only to questions of pastoral practice, where questions were likely to arise, which did not permit delay.

of the convention, and for special sessions or mail votes in emergencies, the governing character of this body was preserved. The recognition of separate conferences and the assignment of vaguely defined functions to them was the essential innovation. It contained within itself the embryo of two future institutions, one of which the local pastoral conference was to develop rapidly, while the other, the district synod was not to mature during the first decade.[14]

In 1858 this system underwent a major revision.[15] At a general conference in the spring of the year it was resolved to establish an executive committee to deal with matters requiring rapid disposition. It was to consist of the three members of the seminary staff and Deindoerfer, was to meet three times a year, and was to circulate its minutes among the conferences.[16] The next ministerial conference, held a few months later in connection with a synodical convention gave further consideration to this innovation, perhaps because the spring conference may have been poorly attended. Grossmann there suggested that functions of church government should be transferred from the ministerium to an executive committee. He pointed out that as long as the ministerium was the church government, it was necessary to obtain the judgment of each member, when decisions had to be made, that it was impossible always to summon the entire body in such cases and that while he had been given discretionary power, it was difficult for him to make sure that his thinking coincided with that of the ministerium. Although somewhat reluctantly the conference agreed to establish an Ausschuss provisionally and to transfer to it functions previously exercised by the ministerium, retaining the members named in the spring.[17]

---

[14] Strictly speaking the separate conferences had already come into existence during the year, before the general conference met in September apparently by decision of the local groups and the general conference therefore merely recognized and regulated them.

[15] It has been noted previously in the text of this chapter and in footnote 3 that the pastoral conference of 1857 concerned itself with a constitution, but that the minutes were lost. Deindoerfer's statement that no essential changes were made has been noted. The pastoral conference at Dubuque in 1856 had again decided that a draft of a constitution should be submitted to the synod, thus apparently postponing the drafting which the synod had assigned to it in 1855 and it is probable that the 1857 draft was drawn up in accordance with this resolution and thus conformed to the system adopted in 1856.

---

[16] Protokollbuch, Minutes Min. Conf., Madison, April 10-16, 1858. These minutes bear a notation that they were written more than a year afterward from scanty notes and do not contain further information as to reasons. Chronik, 21, calls the body the Ministerialausschuss. It is usually simply called the Ausschuss and that name has been used and will continue to be used in referring to it. The usual record of attendance is not given in the Madison minutes, but since a convention of synod was scheduled for that year, it seems likely that it was not well attended by members from a distance.

[17] Minutes Min. Conf., Wartburg, September 13-18, 1858; Chronik, 25. Both agree that the decision was taken at conference rather than convention sessions and Grossmann stated directly that so far the ministerium had been the church government. Elections were to be held at the same session.

Functions transferred to the Ausschuss were matters of a nature apt to occur frequently, such as calls and transfers of pastors, opinions in disciplinary cases, advice on questions of pastoral practice. The new organ thus took over functions which eventually were to become presidential duties. Broader questions occasioned by the new arrangement were referred to the pastors for study, such questions as, what business should definitely come before the Ausschuss, the ministerium and the synod in convention? What should be the relationship of pastors to Ausschuss, Ausschuss to ministerium, ministerium to synod?[18] There can be little doubt that growing numbers

---

The conference held that constitutional changes should be made slowly and after mature consideration and that since God had thus far given enlightenment whenever needed, changes should be considered in reference to him. The arrangement was to be for the immediate future. Elections were held, rather than simply carrying over the Madison body, but the same members were chosen. No restriction was placed on sessions, apparently because Grossmann had asked for a committee which could be called together as often as necessary and composed of pastors who could readily come together. The three months limitation thus was dropped and after Deindoerfer was transferred from Madison to West Union, frequent meetings were possible and they soon were held monthly or even oftener.

[18] Protokollbuch, Ibid. The agenda of the preceding ministerial conference give an illustration of the variety of the business that came before such a gathering. Besides a discussion of an agency such as the Ausschuss it was to consider assignment of newly arriving German emissaries, a request by a pastor for an assistant, a discipline case brought up by a pastor and the installation of S. Fritschel at the seminary. Business of this kind was transferred to the Ausschuss. Along doctrinal lines theses on eschatology were to be discussed and disposition made of another assigned paper which apparently was not ready. There was also the territorial dispute over eastern congregations to be discussed with Buffalo representatives and the recall of Doerfler to be considered. Other matters

by 1858 rendered the older method of handling the business transferred to the *Ausschuss* through pastoral conferences cumbersome and inefficient. The provisional arrangement was to stand for a number of years, before the broader questions forced a more thorough reorganization and the *Ausschuss* accordingly became an important agency of church government for the rest of the first decade.

The two regional conferences of 1856 soon became inadequate. In 1859 an attempt was made to extend the system as it stood, the local conference exercising undefined church governmental functions as well as being a study group. A new name for this institution was borrowed from the Buffalo Synod, *Praepositur*. The ministerium authorized the creation of a third such division in the East, and gave power to the *Ausschuss* to create a fourth in southern Illinois. It was also contemplated that the Indian mission should form still another *Praepositur*.[19] The dual function of this organization, however,

---

of business or policy concerned changes in the constitution for congregations, editorial policy of the *Kirchen-Blatt*, the continuation of the *Chronik*, employment of deaconesses and adoption of a hymnal, Minutes Min. Conf., Madison, April 10-16, 1858.

[19] Minutes Min. Conf., Wartburg, March 24-28, 1859. The name *Praepositur* may have come into usage somewhat earlier. The resolution provided that an additional one be created for the East. The old eastern division in Wisconsin and the western in Iowa may already have borne the name. The retention of the dual character is not specified, but since no change was indicated until the next year, it was obviously kept. The arrangement was an ineffectual step in the direction of district synods.

did not work well and in 1860 the Praeposituren were abolished. In their place local conferences continued to exist, which had no functions of church government. Their number grew with the expansion of synod and before the decade ended there were at least six of them.[20] The provision of 1858 according to which minutes of the Ausschuss were to circulate among the conferences may have been carried out, for the minutes of each conference also were for a time circulated among the others. This arrangement, however, had its difficulties, for conferences on occasion criticized points in the minutes of others. The Iowa Conference found it necessary in 1861 to adopt for itself and suggest to other conferences a mode of procedure designed to avoid inter-conference squabbles on this account. Conference sermons were to be submitted for review together with the minutes and papers, which were to be furnished by secretaries on request. It appears that the conferences generally held the quarterly sessions first adopted in 1854, and that attendance was good.[21]

---

[20] Chronik, 38. The change was made by the convention of 1860. By 1864 there was an Iowa Conference extending from St. Sebald westward and including Elkport to the east, which had been in existence at least since 1861, because minutes exist for a session in that year, Minutes, Conference, Maxfield, July 5-7, 1861, in Protokollbuch; and a Des Moines Conference, the formation of which was suggested in a letter, Burk - Grossmann, Germanville, July 14, 1861, and which was in existence by 1862, since Ausschuss Minutes, March 26, 1862, refer to its minutes. The eastern division of 1856 continued to exist as the Wisconsin Conference and the Praepositur authorized in 1859 was organized as the Eastern or Toledo Conference in February 1862, K. M. 1863, 1, 8. A conference had also come into existence as then authorized in southern Illinois and Missouri although it was not organized before 1860, when a letter, Schieferdecker - Synod, Altenburg, June 7, 1860, inquired about procedure. Another letter, Schieferdecker - Grossmann, August 16, 1861, mentions it as then in existence. A Galena Conference which extended into eastern Iowa is mentioned as early as 1861, Synodalbericht 1861, 4. Not improbably this group was separated from the Iowa Conference in 1859 or 1860. Tagebuch von H. F. Dietz mentions conferences at Galena October 1858 and January 1859 and on the latter occasion refers to the presence of Grossmann and the two Fritschels. For later sessions, Galena, November 1859 and February 1860, Dubuque, May 1859, Tetes des Mortes, September 1860, those mentioned as present were from the vicinity and none from the Wartburg are mentioned. Presumably therefore the latter formed a separate conference during that period. Membership of the Galena Conference is given K. M. 1865, 3 and 4, 32. If the Indian mission formed a conference, mention of it has escaped the writer, but it was certainly a separate division with its own head. All letters cited herein are in I. S. D.

No doubt the isolation of the pastors made the conferences pleasurable occasions for meeting kindred minds and for friendly personal intercourse which may account in part for the relative frequency of sessions and the good attendance. They were not, however, merely or chiefly social gatherings, but were designed for study and stimulation. Papers in various theological disciplines were regularly assigned and although the full original program may have been modified, they were accompanied by special services and the provisions already indicated, make it clear that assignments in this respect also had educative purposes. Discussions often were intensive and criticism keen and penetrating. The large number of conferences and resultant small membership of each, meant that members were kept busy, through frequent and varied assignments.[22] Along such lines, conferences after 1860 were to function as study centers for pastors and on the whole did so. Occasionally, however, instances occurred in which rubs developed between them and the Ausschuss, because conferences, reverting to functions exercised before 1860, took it upon themselves to make decisions along lines of church government or to enter protests in regard to synodical policies.[23]

---

[21] Protokollbuch, Minutes Iowa Conference, Maxfield, July 5-6, 1861. This conference heard the minutes of other conferences read and decided not to enter judgments concerning them in its minutes. Instead a special book should be kept in which obscurities or questions were to be entered, which then were to be taken up at general ministerial conferences. The same course was recommended to other conferences. In regard to sermons, they were always to accompany the minutes and a critical review as to form and content was to be assigned to some member, but again nothing was to be entered in the minutes. The arrangement in regard to conference papers noted in the text was also suggested. The writer has not found evidence to indicate how generally such suggestions were observed. Since this conference included the leaders of the synod, its suggestions indicate the policy they thought desirable. Grossmann and Deindoerfer were present, G. Fritschel was absent and excused, S. Fritschel was then in Europe. It may be noted, however, that minutes of only two other conferences were mentioned as read. The date of the conference suggests that it observed the quarterly sessions and sessions in October 1860 and January 1861 are given for the Wisconsin Conference. The Toledo Conference met each month, at least in the beginning, K. M. 1863, 1, 8. The correspondence in the I. S. D. indicates also that sessions were frequent and that attendance was good. Only one member was absent at the Maxfield Conference and was noted as excused.

---

[22] Protokollbuch, Ibid. At the Maxfield Conference Pastor Hoerlein, read no less than three papers, one was not discussed, because it lay in the field of historical theology and according to conference rules such topics were not discussed. A second was not quite completed, it was read, but discussion was postponed to the next conference, pending completion. It was in systematic theology. The third in the practical field was taken apart and after Hoerlein had been convinced that the views expressed were erroneous, he was reassigned the same topic for the next conference. Hoerlein also delivered the confessional address and Deindoerfer preached, besides delivering a fourth paper which was also thoroughly discussed and recommended to other conferences, even though one of the members did not entirely agree with the conclusions. The absent G. Fritschel also had sent an assigned paper, discussion of which was postponed. Besides this the conference dealt with the minutes of other conferences as indicated in footnote 21. In addition to the papers carried over, all other members, except Grossmann, were assigned work for the next conference. Scattered references in the correspondence in the I. S. D. indicate that this was a fairly typical program and that interest in the papers and discussion was keen.

General ministerial conferences continued to play an important role through 1859. Two met in that year, one in March and one in September. It has been noted elsewhere that they dealt with the critical problems of that year, the Toledo controversy, and with the affairs of the Indian mission, as well as with such interna as the congregational constitution and the visitation order.[24] The convention of 1860, however, differentiated between the functions of conventions and ministerial assemblies and tipped the balance in favor of the convention. Before it were to come: doctrinal questions, if it were necessary that synod take a position, relationships with other synods, adoption of uniform regulations, affairs relating to common undertakings, administration of synodical properties, and appeals to the synod. To the ministerium were assigned calls and transfers, examinations, ordinations, installations and visitations.[25] This narrowed the sphere of the ministerium to that of the matters already placed under the *Ausschuss*. The latter, established only provisionally in 1858, was confirmed, with the provision that it be responsible to the ministerium and required to report to it, but that it remain in charge even during the time when the ministerial conference was in session.[26]

---

[23] The Des Moines or Central Iowa Conference objected to the minimum salary resolution of 1861 and requested the Ausschuss to ignore it, as the latter noted in rejecting the proposal, because the resolution was entirely misunderstood, Ausschuss Minutes, March 26, 1862. Later the same conference directed a pastor otherwise assigned by the Ausschuss to Fort Dodge and installed him, even though the call was conditioned on payments to the pastor from Reiseprediger funds. The Ausschuss issued a strong reprimand. Ausschuss Minutes, June 1-2, 1862. The Wisconsin Conference, List dissenting, took an independent stand on the ordination of Sussner in 1864, Ausschuss Minutes, April 22, 1864. The Ausschuss referred the matter to the synod, which issued a reprimand, though not to the conference, but to the members involved in the affair, Synodalbericht 1864, 43.

[24] Protokollbuch, Minutes Min. Conf., Wartburg, March 24-28, and Galena, September 16-20, 1859.

---

[25] *Chronik*, 36-7, somewhat repetitiously states the division thus:

"1. vor die Synodalversammlung gehoeren...folgende Dinge:
"a. Verhandlungen ueber Lehrpunkte, wenn die Synode von innen oder von aussen her veranlasst ist, ein Bekenntnis aufzustellen oder sich ueber die praktische Behandlung u. Werthstellung einzelner Lehren auszusprechen.
"b. Alle diejenigen Ordnungen u. Bestimmungen, welche alle Synodalgemeinden gleichmaessig angehen.
"c. Berichterstattung ueber Vorfaelle von allgemeiner die ganze Synode angehender Bedeutung, zum Zweck der Kenntnisnahme oder auch der Aneignung des Geschehenen.
"d. Verhandlungen. welche das Verhaeltnis der Synode zu andern Synoden betreffen, z.B. Delegationen.
"e. Allgemeine, die Gemeinden angeh. Angelegenheiten, z. b. Gesangbuecher etc.
"f. Allgemeine von der ganzen Synode betriebene Werke als Mission, Seminar etc.
"g. Verwaltung des Synodaleigenthums.
"h. Appelationen an die Synode.
"2. Vor das Ministerium gehoeren alle diejenigen kirchenregimentlichen Angelegenheiten, die ihrer Natur nach nur oder doch am ziemlichsten von Dienern des Wortes vollzogen werden koennen, als z. B. Pfarrstellenbesetzung, Examination, Ordination, Introduktion, Visitation u. drgl."

This differentiation thus clearly made the convention the governing agency of the synod and gave the ministerium a restricted, subordinate position. The ministerial conference was permitted to continue in existence, but it was realized that the convention in which the congregations were represented should handle all matters which concerned all congregations equally. Other resolutions ordered that the convention was to consist of pastors and congregational delegates as voting members and of candidates and teachers as advisory members. Synodical offices were also defined with the duties of the officers, consisting of president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, and chronicler.[27] The Ausschuss was confirmed as an agency of the ministerium, rather than of synod. Since the ministerium had already transferred the functions left to it to the Ausschuss, there was thereafter less occasion for the convocation of the ministerial conference. It met in connection with the conventions, as formerly, but only one more independent session was called, which met in 1862.

---

[26] Ibid., 37. After confirmation of the Ausschuss is noted, comes the statement, "und zugleich die Bestimmung getroffen, dass seine Befugnisse waehrend der Sitzungszeit des Ministeriums keineswegs auf dieses uebergehen...."

[27] Ibid., 37. The position of the mission committee, which was not abolished until 1861 was not defined. Missions were recognized as a synodical cause, but in the next year the direction was given to the Ausschuss. The treasurer was in charge of only one treasury, though as will be noted later, there were several. Nothing was said about the editor of the Kirchen-Blatt. Some confusion therefore continued to exist which was not finally resolved until 1864. The president was to call conventions together, if necessary, ahead of the scheduled time, the synod itself in convention determining the regular time and was to preside and give a report as well as to execute resolutions and represent synod over against the state. The vice-president had no special functions. The secretary was to keep the minutes, inform absent members of the resolutions within two months and, on request, furnish information about the resolutions.

The old order, under which the assembly of pastors had governed the synod, was thus revised, first by the creation of the Ausschuss in 1858, which substituted an executive body for routine functions, and much more extensively by the change of 1860 which recognized that the remaining functions belonged to the more representative convention. Pastors, however, continued to form a majority of the latter body and it was thus the ministerial conference rather than the clergy which ceased to dominate. For practical purposes too, the Ausschuss was for some years to remain the dominant agency, overshadowing the individuals who acted as synodical officers.[28]

---

[28] While there are no minutes extant for pastoral conferences in 1860 and 1861, Chronik, 35, for 1860 and Synodalbericht 1861, 3, for the next year indicate that they were held in connection with the synodical conventions. The constitutional changes of 1860, however, do not seem to have come as proposals of a ministerial conference. Chronik, 35, states that a pastor presented a draft to the convention. Ministerial conferences had previously usually held discussions in advance of business to come before the convention. In future, members were to be advised beforehand in regard to business coming up, presumably by synodical officers and local conferences were given the right to submit resolutions three months before the set time, Ibid., 40.

On the other hand it should be noted that several regulations were adopted intended to encourage congregations to make use of their right of being represented at synodical conventions.[29]

The convention of the next year, 1861, also gave consideration to constitutional matters, but made no fundamental changes. The transfer of the supervision of the Indian mission to the Ausschuss, which has been discussed in the preceding chapter, was doubtless designed to promote efficiency, but was anomalous in that it placed the executive agency of the ministerium in charge of a synodical function. The intention does not seem to have been to transform the Ausschuss into a synodical agency, for it was specified that in the sphere reserved to it, the power resided in the ministerium, the Ausschuss conducting affairs, but being responsible to it.[30] In 1862 a ministerial conference met, probably because the convention due that year had already been held, but it was decided that no session would be necessary in 1863; however, another was to be held in conjunction with the convention of 1864. It spent much of its time in theological discussion and in consideration of pastoral matters, but also approved a collection of synodical regulations in force with some revisions and dealt with financial affairs.[31]

---

[29] Congregations at a distance were permitted to choose delegates from congregations near the place of meeting and neighboring congregations could elect a common delegate. It was not specified, that such delegates could cast more than one vote, but that may have been the intention. It may be doubted whether such arrangements were practicable, but another regulation permitted Filialen which were too far away from main congregations to make a meeting for the election of a common delegate practicable, to send a separate delegate of their own. Congregations like pastors were also required to send formal excuses, if they were unable to send a delegate. Chronik, 35. In the convention of 1860 itself only four congregations were represented, Madison, Cottage Grove, St. Sebald and Toledo, while seventeen pastors were present and nine absent, Ibid., 34-5. It may also be noted that already in 1858 the synod had tried to stress congregational membership in synod by providing that if congregations refused to join the synod without sound reasons and simply because of a preference for independence, the synod might call their pastors away, if they were needed in synodical congregations, Ibid., 25.

The Ausschuss had as early as 1861 taken up the study of constitutional problems, assigning each of its members readings and reports on church government.[32] While no progress was reported one of the members had a draft constitution ready by 1864. Relationships between the Ausschuss and the ministerium in the meantime did not always proceed smoothly. In 1862 the latter body considered the possibility that its judgment and that of the ministerium might vary in a pastoral case then in controversy. It decided that it could not assume responsibility, if its judgment were reversed and that it might have to enter a protest. If executive action were involved, it would ask that others be instructed to take it, since the ministerium could not expect the Ausschuss to act against its conscience.[33] It did not come to that point, but conflicts with conferences occurred repeatedly. The Des Moines Conference expressed dissatisfaction with the policy on home missions in 1862 and was dissatisfied with a number of pastoral placement arrangements.[34] In the east Doerfler likewise had objections of a similar kind.[35] The differences with the missionaries over colonization also seems to have caused considerable friction. In the Wisconsin Conference, the Ausschuss had so much trouble that it came to feel that synodical loyalty was precarious in that region.[36] The president's report in 1864 described the Ausschuss policy in regard to pastoral placements as aiming at long tenures and acting in conformity with Lutheran precedents and the Scriptures, but complained of irregularities and disregard of synodical regulations on the part of pastors and conferences.[37]

---

[30] Synodalbericht 1861, 36-7. Dr. Fikenscher had introduced a number of resolutions relating to both the congregational and the synodical constitution. Their import has been noted in chapter V.

[31] Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862. This meeting had been arranged at the ministerial session at the convention of 1861, Chronik, 56, the agenda listed a number of papers, but most of the attention seems to have been given to a highly controversial essay by Deindoerfer on the binding character of the symbols. The visitation order was dropped and the Senior authorized to employ members of the Ausschuss and in emergencies other pastors as visitors. Financial regulations will be noted later. The Instruktion for pastors organizing congregations discussed in chapter V was approved. The collection of synodical regulations is in the I. S. D. in a MS. entitled, Zusammenstellung der in unserer Synode geltenden Verordnungen, 1862, and was prepared by Deindoerfer.

[32] Ausschuss Minutes, December 14, 1861.

---

[33] Ibid., June 1-2, 1862. The occasion was the conclusion of the Ausschuss that Pastor Endres was unfit for the ministry. The case was reported to the ministerium at the next conference, but no action was recorded, Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862. It seems probable that the Ausschuss feared that Endres had friends who would object.

[34] Ausschuss Minutes, March 26 and June 1-2, 1860. Most of the issues have been discussed in other connections. The conference felt that missionary endeavor should be centered in Iowa and objected to the 1861 resolution on salaries. It endorsed financial claims of Dr. Fikenscher, who seems to have been a storm center, took independent action in regard to the assignment of Pastor Stuermer and was at odds with the Ausschuss over the successor of List at Des Moines.

[35] See the sources in footnote 65, ch. VII. There were also questions of the wisdom of the Ausschuss in admitting Dunsing from Missouri antecedents after only brief acquaintance,

---

especially when Missouri cast slurs on his fitness, letters, Beckel - Grossmann, August ? and 21, 1863, and Schieferdecker - Grossmann, October 12, 1863. See also Lutheraner XX, 2, 14. It might be added that about a dozen years later, Dunsing left Iowa to go to Missouri and was accepted. Ausschuss Minutes, August 10, 1864, indicate that it felt some dissatisfaction at a later time over actions of the Toledo Conference. All letters in I. S. D.

[36] As early as 1860 the Wisconsin Conference refused somewhat curtly to raise loans for the seminary, letter, Kluge - Grossmann, Cottage Grove, March 5, 1860. A conference had provided that each pastor secure loans to help meet the pressing seminary debt in his congregation and also that he induce members and other friends to obligate themselves to make regular small payments each quarter. The conference took this to be a recommendation, not an obligation as the Ausschuss apparently contended. The tone of its reply seemed objectionable not only to the Ausschuss, but also to others, see a letter, List - Grossmann, Des Moines, April 14, 1860, in I. S. D. After the visitations in 1862 there was an extensive series of transfers of pastors. After them a letter, Kluge - Grossmann, January 2, 1863, objected to a statement by Pastor Hoerlein that the Wisconsin pastors were rebellious and that Hoerlein as a loyal man had been placed there to help create a better spirit. Since Hoerlein had been in close touch with Wartburg, his unwise statement probably reflected Ausschuss thinking. In 1864, Sussnor's ordination partially involved the conference, although two of its members finally undertook it on their own responsibility. Ausschuss Minutes, April 22, 1864. Two of the Wisconsin pastors, Rohrlack and Himmler finally left the synod in 1864 and 1865.

[37] Synodalbericht 1864, 8-9. The ideal was permanent tenure, but changes were to be made when required for the sake

In the anniversary convention of 1864 which celebrated the tenth birthday of the synod, the adoption of a constitution was a major item of business. Two papers were submitted on the topic, Liberty and Order, which presented general principles relating to divine and human precepts, the right of the church to establish the latter and the duty of according them obedience, in so far as they did not violate conscience, in the spirit of Christian love.[38] After they had been discussed and their essential content adopted, two drafts of the projected constitution, one by S. Fritschel of the Ausschuss and one from the ranks of the ministerium by Klindworth, were introduced. The former became the basis of discussion and the latter was used for comparison and modification. The formulation resulting, became the first written constitution of the Iowa Synod.[39]

---

of pastor or congregation. Lutheran precedents were to guide unless free church conditions varied so greatly from state church conditions that they were not applicable. In that case guidance was sought from Scriptures.

[38] The papers were by G. Fritschel and Schmidt, the former was made the basis of discussion and the latter drawn into it, Synodalbericht 1864, 9. Fritschel's paper follows, pp. 10-23. Theses summarizing it as modified and adopted are given pp. 23-29 and except for the first three also in Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 88-9.

[39] Synodalbericht 1864, 37. The constitution as adopted follows, pp. 38-41, and is also printed in Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 89-92. The writer has been unable to find copies of the Fritschel and Klindworth drafts.

The constitution opened with a definition of the synod's confessional position, which was not changed, but the old definition of the Richtung was omitted, while new paragraphs avowing allegiance to Scriptures and rejecting all forms of unionism were added. Synod was defined as composed of pastors and congregations holding membership, all pastors and representatives of the congregations constituting the convention. Regulations governing admission and withdrawal of pastors and congregations were incorporated as developed during the decade, the right of withdrawal being granted with honorable dismissal if no complaints were on file. The synod constituted the supreme church government, in charge of general functions and institutions and in an advisory capacity striving to maintain the greatest possible measure of uniformity in congregational practices and institutions. Intervals between synodical conventions were not specified, but left for the determination of each convention. A long section on synodical officers defined elections and duties, but not the term of president, vice-president, secretary and treasurer, transferring the former duties of the ministerium to the president. A separate section confirmed the existing regulations for the operation of the seminary and another created a committee to direct the Indian mission. Local conferences were defined as study groups without church governmental functions.[40]

---

[40] The constitution consisted of thirty-one paragraphs, grouped in nine sections. I Confession and Doctrine, paragraphs 1-3; II Composition of Synod, 4-5; III Admission and

The constitution obviously reflected the experience of the first decade. In general it defined the institutions and practices which had developed during that time, for the most part confirming them with only minor changes. The major change was clearly the abolition of the old dualism of ministerium and convention. General ministerial conferences were not abolished, but there was no longer occasion for holding them, unless doctrinal controversy should make it desirable to do so and even then, they could only clarify trends of thinking. The functions to which the ministerium had clung, were now transferred to the president and he was made responsible to the convention, to which appeals from his decisions were to be made. The Ausschuss was dropped, but provision was made for a committee with which the president might consult, if he deemed that necessary. Its special functions of supervision over the seminary and the Indian mission were transferred to committees elected for those purposes. At long last, therefore, simple executive responsibility in routine matters of church government was substituted for the cumbersome older system of collective ministerial action.[41]

Withdrawal, 6-11; IV Duties and Powers of Synod, 12-14; V Synodical Conventions, 15; VI Synodical Officers, 16-23; VII Seminary, 24-27; VIII Indian mission, 28; IX Conferences, 29-31. The president was given the right to call special sessions of the synod. Terms of officers seem to have run from convention to convention. K. B. VII, 11, 83, indicates that the constitution was not regarded as completed, but that further study and subsequent alteration were contemplated.

[41] The advisory committee consisted of the vice-president (Deindoerfer) who was to preside and the two theological teachers.

While the constitution mentioned only four synodical officers, there were in fact as the elections show a number of others, as well as a number of committees, some of which were mentioned in the constitution, while others were not. In addition to the four listed officers, there was a chronicler and a manager of the printery and two editors of the Kirchenblatt. As will be shown later, there were also three treasuries in addition to the Synodalkasse and each had a treasurer, two of whom were members of standing committees. Of these, besides the advisory committee to the president and the mission committee, there existed a supervisory committee, an electoral committee and an examination committee for the seminary, also a publication committee and a committee on schools. There was also a board of trustees. The constitution gave the president the right to name floor committees for synodical conventions, but did not mention the creation of additional synodical committees.

The creation of the Synodalkasse for the support of the seminary in 1855 has been noted in chapter IV. It is probable that a separate mission treasury was established in 1858 together with the original mission committee.[42] In 1859 the ministerial conference resolved to establish a Ministerialkasse and ordered the lifting of offerings in all synodical congregations for this treasury from which administrative expenses were to be defrayed, and also a Pfarrwitwenkasse, to which each pastor obligated himself to make an annual contribution to establish a fund for the support of pastors' widows.[43] The Synodical convention of 1860 changed the provisions in regard to the former treasury. It was to become the synodical treasury, or Synodalkasse, the earlier treasury of this name having become the seminary treasury. Only one regular annual offering was to be lifted for it, but it was to receive special offerings on visitation days and any surplus from the treasury of the Kirchen-Blatt, as well as rent income from the Dubuque property. Travel costs,[44] expenses on

---

[42] The writer has not been able to find official notice of the establishment of either the committee or the treasury. Notice has been taken of the emergence of the committee in 1858 in chapter IX. The first official notice of the treasury is the election of Klindworth as treasurer in place of S. Fritschel in 1859. Protokollbuch, Minutes Min. Conf., Galena, September 16-20, 1859. Obviously therefore this conference which established two other treasuries did not establish this one. It

---

is possible that the establishment of both committee and treasury was resolved at the pastoral conference in June 1857, the minutes of which were lost and then delayed until the next year, because of the loss.

[43] Ibid. and Chronik, 32. The Sundays designated for offerings for the ministerial treasury were the first in Lent and the thirteenth after Trinity. No regulations were drawn for the Pfarrwitwenkasse. This was to be done later, but was not done until 1864. The status of this treasury, whether synodical or private, was to become controversial but in the earlier years it had the former status. The occasion for its establishment was probably the death of Pastor Sack in Kansas although he was unmarried. Buffalo had such a treasury which may have served as model but since relations had then become unfriendly no attempt seems to have been made to secure details on management from that synod.

[44] Chronik, 35-6, and Deindoerfer's Zusammenstellung 1862. The offering was to be taken on the Reformation Day or the Harvest Home Festival. The Zusammenstellung gives more details than Chronik, so it is possible that the ministerial conference at Dubuque in 1862 may have made changes. The

synodical properties and later certain payments to synodical officers were to be paid from it. The Pfarrwitwenkasse received no further regulation until 1864 when the convention resolved that the annual pastoral contribution was to continue with the proviso that in case of death a special assessment

---

minutes indicate only a discussion of failures to lift the offering and the voting of compensation to Deindoerfer and Grossmann. The former seems to have had his rent paid from the treasury before he had a parsonage, and seems to have been allowed the former rent payment as travel allowance, no doubt as Ausschuss member. Grossmann was to receive the same amount. A rent payment to the treasury to Pastor Dietz, Dubuque, from this treasury was also ordered by the convention of 1861, though the reasons are not given, Chronik, 56. Regularly this treasury paid travel expenses for visitation trips. If possible, it also paid for missionary journeys, presumably by Reiseprediger, K. B. VII, 1, 7. The treasury of the Kirchenblatt obviously was established in 1858 when that paper came into being and received subscription payments to pay publication costs. From numerous complaints in Grossmann's correspondence, it would seem that the editors had charge of the treasury, they were Grossmann and G. Fritschel. The surplus was to be paid over if and when there was one. The transformation of the older synodical into a seminary treasury does not seem to have taken place in 1860. The change may have been gradual and unofficial, or it may also have been authorized at the conference of 1857 which decided on the relocation of the seminary. Regular offerings for this treasury continued to be lifted on the three high festival days of the church year, K. B. VII, 1, 6. List, Zusammenstellung 1864 notes a resolution of that year that pastors were to make an annual contribution of at least $.50 to the Synodalkasse, as well as others instructing the treasurer to send notice to delinquent congregations and ordering offerings not lifted in 1863 to be made up. In regard to the payment ordered to be made to Grossmann in 1862 it may be added that earlier that year Klindworth had remitted an unstated small sum to Grossmann as collected from the pastors in recognition of his services and with special reference to the peace reigning in Iowa's church government in contrast to others which suffered from domination or servility, letter, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, April 15, 1862, in I. S. D. Grossmann had been ill that winter.

be paid by all pastors and a special offering be lifted in all congregations. A constitution was to be ready by the next convention.[45]

With the exception of the last, which was not drawn upon during the decade, all these treasuries had to contend with difficulties. Neither the seminary nor the mission treasury could count on a sufficient income from the congregations to support their causes. The synodical treasury in 1862 also had a deficit.[46] There was trouble too about lifting offerings as resolved by synod, sometimes apparently, because pastors were remiss and also because of objections from congregations. The ministerial conference at Dubuque held that pastors were bound to announce offerings regularly on the designated days, once that had become the established order. If it was not so, it was the pastor's duty to induce the congregation to make it so.[47] On occasion congregations, which were in straits themselves, may have diverted offerings which they lifted, to the congregational treasury.[48] Since most of the early books are not extant, it is impossible to say whether they were accurately kept, but complaints about faulty accounting in the Kirchen-Blatt were not uncommon.[49] The first audit of which there is record, was ordered by the convention of 1861.[50]

---

[45] Synodalbericht 1864, 42. Both regular and special assessments were $1.00. K. B. VI, 3, 24, indicates that annual payments for this treasury had been due from all pastors and teachers, beginning with 1860. The treasurer was Schueller, chosen in 1859. The treasurers of the synodical treasury changed frequently, Deindoerfer, 1859, Klindworth, 1860, H. Weege, 1861, F. Fritschel, 1864. The last two were laymen. K. B. VI, 7, 56, contains a listing of all the treasuries with their treasurers in 1863.

[46] The difficulties of the seminary and mission treasuries have been discussed in earlier chapters. The latter, however, received sufficient support from Germany to meet its bills and wind up with a balance, while the former ran deeply into debt, caused partly, but no means entirely, by building at St. Sebald. The ministerial conference of 1862 resolved that a deficit in the synodical treasury should be met either by lifting a special offering at the end of the year or by securing appropriations from congregational treasuries, Protokollbuch, Minutes Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862. In 1864 the Synodalkasse debt had grown, K. B. VII, 1, 7. Deindoerfer, who wrote the notice, indicated that this was because the regular offering was not lifted, the treasury usually receiving only offerings taken during visitations. He added that if in some congregations regular offerings for the seminary were not taken on the specified day other days might be substituted.

---

[47] Ibid. The discussion began over a motion by Pastor Hoerlein to use the second method indicated in the preceding footnote to meet the deficit in the synodical treasury. Grossmann then took the attitude that regular offerings must be announced by the pastor without consultation with the congregation. The conference adopted the order noted.

[48] Ausschuss Minutes, April 20, 1861. It had been reported that offerings which should have gone to the seminary had in Dubuque been diverted toward payment of the congregational debt. There were strenuous objections and an inquiry was ordered, the results of which are not recorded.

[49] Pastors may have been at fault in casually making all kinds of remittances in letters to headquarters. Complaints from various quarters appear in the correspondence in the I. S. D., e. g., a letter, Brueckner - Grossmann, Spring Creek, April 28, 1863, complains of errors in the Kirchen-Blatt treasury and of failure to receipt congregational offerings. Another, Schieferdecker - Grossmann, October 12, 1863, also brings the latter complaint. It is difficult to find through such books as there are. They may be accurate, but it is evident that the men who kept them were not trained bookkeepers. From the receipts in the Kirchen-Blatt an estimate of synodical income for the years beginning with 1858 can be made, but since according to the complaints they were not accurate and since without the record of the expenditures in the missing books they would not mean much, it has not seemed worthwhile to do this, particularly because the task would be time-consuming, since only individual listings and no totals are given.

[50] Chronik, 56. Klindworth was appointed to audit all books.

The acquisition of property by the synod, at Dubuque and St. Sebald, occasioned problems of management, which were complicated by a heavy burden of debt. The convention of 1860 provided for a commission of management to deal with this problem. The task of the committee proved difficult, probably because in Dubuque, due to indebtedness of the congregation to the synod, a situation existed which varied considerably from that at St. Sebald. The convention of 1861 met this by providing for two different commissions, one for each property. In the reorganization of 1864 the commissions were not carried over. The functions of that for St. Sebald were no doubt transferred to the new supervisory committee. The Dubuque commission was probably dropped, because negotiations were under way looking toward the acquisition of this property by the congregation in Dubuque. By 1866 this transfer had been consummated.[51]

Ownership of property also made incorporation of the synod desirable. Because of the financial complications involved in the acquisition of the St. Sebald property and construction of the seminary the title deeds were in the name of private persons throughout the decade. Incorporation was first discussed in general terms at the convention of 1858 and the discussion related to the incorporation both of the synod and of its individual congregations.[52] The convention of 1861 returned to the point and resolved that the synod should be incorporated and instructed the commission for the Dubuque property to take the necessary steps. Since no constitution existed as yet, the first two paragraphs of the constitution for the congregations, which defined confessional position and Richtung of the synod were to be taken as basis with the provision that eventual dissidents departing from them should lose all claim to synodical property. It was further to be provided that if dissensions should arise within the lines drawn and the number of dissidents should exceed one third of the voting membership of the synodical convention, the property should be divided in proportion to loyal and withdrawing synodical congregations.[53]

---

[51] The establishment of the commission is noted, Chronik, 39, and its division into two, p. 55. List, Zusammenstellung 1864 records an offer to turn the property over to the congregation, if the debt were paid. St. John's Diamond Jubilee records the acquisition by the congregation in 1866.

---

[52] Chronik, 25. The seminary property originally stood in the name of Mr. Kleinlein and later in that of M. H. Fritschel, the father of the professors. These parties had either originally advanced the money or later pledged their own properties to guarantee the debt. This information was incidentally supplied during an investigation of the Klindworth affair in 1875 and can be found in the pamphlet, Bericht ueber die auf Anlass der Schrift Past. Klindworth's "Die traurigen Zustaende in der Iowa-Synode" veranstaltate Untersuchung durch die vom Praesidium der Iowa-Synode ernannte synodale Committee, 88. Suggestions to congregations in regard to safeguarding of property rights have been discussed in chapter V.

[53] Synodalbericht 1861, 38; Chronik, 55.

This resolution seems never to have been put into effect. The convention of 1864 again resolved to incorporate and chose eight trustees. The members of the Iowa Conference were to take the necessary legal steps. The first three paragraphs of the new constitution were to determine property rights and dissidents were to lose all claims.[54] This convention also resolved to make inquiries whether the seminary and the Indian mission should be incorporated separately.[55] Articles of incorporation under the laws of the State of Iowa, dated April 9, 1867, indicate that some steps were taken toward carrying out this resolution, but it is doubtful whether the process was carried to consummation.[56] It is improbable that anything was done about the Indian mission, but the seminary seems to have been incorporated at the same time.[57]

---

[54] Synodalbericht 1864, 41. Six pastors and two laymen were chosen as trustees.

[55] Ibid., 42.

[56] The document entitled, Articles of Incorporation of the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Iowa, is in S. Fritschel Documents. It follows the instructions, but gives only seven trustees, omitting H. Weege. It is attested, signed and sealed by a notary public under the date given.

[57] The investigation Bericht cited in footnote 52 states, p. 21, that the seminary was incorporated and had its own charter, but that the synod was not. Seminary incorporation is again mentioned and the same date given, p. 89. Transfer of the property to the trustees, of whom Pastor Klindworth was one, is mentioned, p. 88, with the explanation that ignorance of procedure caused delay in executing synodical resolutions in regard to incorporation. It may be that synod was incorporated in 1867, but that the articles were cancelled when changes were made in the confessional paragraphs in 1873.

CHAPTER XI

ACTIVITIES: SYNODICAL UNDERTAKINGS 1854-1864

From the very start the Iowa Synod felt the need of a church paper of its own. Neuendettelsau's Kirchliche Mittheilungen indeed brought synodical news and was eager to receive them, but it served to stimulate interest in Germany. Vital as German support was and as were the services of this German publication in maintaining it, the circulation of the organ of the Gesellschaft in America was too limited to serve all the needs of the new synod. Loehe himself anticipated this need as early as 1853 when he suggested that the seminary then still in Saginaw undertake publication of a paper which would bring primarily news from Germany, but would also state the position of his adherents in America.[1] Nothing came of this, since the break with Missouri and the removal from Michigan were then imminent. Early in 1854, however, Grossmann reported to Loehe that it would be helpful, if a paper could be published which would set forth the differences between the Lutheran and the Reformed confessions of which German elements in the Dubuque vicinity were woefully ignorant.[2]

---

[1] Letter, Loehe - Grossmann, Weege, Deindoerfer and Amman, Neuendettelsau, March 31, 1853, in Loehe Papers. He suggested the title, Nachrichten aus der Heimat and offered to furnish news from the Gesellschaft, while personal news could be paid for by the senders. The position was to be stated non-controversially in the first issue.

[2] Letter, Grossmann - Loehe, February 10, 1854, in I. S. D., type copy. Grossmann referred particularly to the settlement at Sherrill's Mount where great confessional confusion existed.

At the first ministerial conference after the organization of the synod, in October 1854, the question of a church paper was given intensive consideration. Grossmann's idea was adopted, but the paper was to have a much broader scope. It was to contain articles on current questions in consideration both of members and of people among whom missions might be begun, polemics, German church news, official notices, and advertising. German friends were asked to contribute articles regularly. The means for publication were to be raised by a sale of stock and publication was to begin late that year. The title Kirchenblatt, was adopted, Grossmann named editor and even the contents of the first issue were determined.[3] Whether an attempt was actually made to sell stock does not appear, but it proved to be impossible to carry out the plan for several years.[4] The synod thus lacked an official organ for a number of years. During this time Kirchliche Mittheilungen printed a good deal of material from synodical circles, but this was never a satisfactory solution of the problem. On occasion the synod was embarassed by editorial statements, and not only was it a constant struggle to maintain a regular flow of reports to Neuendettelsau, but it sometimes happened that materials were lost in transmission.[5] The editors of the Kirchliche Mittheilungen on their part often complained about a dearth of American news and indicated that they might have to suspend publication.[6]

---

[3] Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, October 30, 1854. The first category undoubtedly was to serve Grossmann's purpose among others. Polemics against opponents close at hand and farther away were to be included but as matter of principle controversy with Missouri was to be avoided. Church news were to be drawn from other papers, all those named were German, but it was probably lack of acquaintance with American publications rather than intent that left them out. German friends were to be asked primarily for historical papers. The size was to be that of K. M. The feature of the first issue was to be an article on Old Lutherans, which was to serve as an indication of the position of the synod. Another article was to deal with Christian instruction of youth. The only news items listed were ordination notices.

[4] Chronik, 7, states that lack of means prevented publication.

---

[5] See footnote 2, chapter VII for an instance of embarrassment. K. M. 1855, 11, 85, reports that the report on the convention of that year was lost in the mails.

[6] Loehe complained of a lack of news in letters to Grossmann, Neuendettelsau, March 3 and April 21, 1856, and a letter, Bauer - S. Fritschel, January 26, 27, 1856, is entirely devoted to the subject, indicating that publication actually had to be suspended for several months and that permanent suspension was considered. The loss of news in the mails was partially responsible, but a growing misunderstanding which later in that year induced Grossmann to go to Europe also played a part. The Iowa men seem to have felt that Neuendettelsau was diverting its interest from them to deaconess work, at least the letters deny that this was the case. According to Bauer's letter the Iowa men seem to have interpreted their release from contractual obligations in 1855, discussed in chapter IV to mean that the Gesellschaft was washing its hands of them. S. Fritschel's Vereinbarung in S. Fritschel Documents included a provision for keeping and sending in diaries regularly. Since he did not keep one after that time, it seems to have been thought that the Gesellschaft no longer desired them. All letters cited are in I. S. D.

In 1856 the western division of the ministerial conference resolved on publication of the Kirchenblatt once more and named a committee to execute the resolution. A few months later the convention of that year confirmed the decision and specified that needs of members of the congregations should be kept in mind and unprofitable controversy with Missouri avoided.[7] Again, there was delay, but the committee at length made arrangements with a printer which a ministerial conference in 1857 found acceptable. Publication under the title Kirchen-Blatt der evangelisch lutherischen Synode von Iowa was resolved once more and monthly issues directed. Pastors were asked to recommend the paper in and outside of their congregations and to secure subscriptions from members. Copies of the first issue were to be sent to friendly pastors of the Missouri and the Buffalo Synods and subscriptions solicited in Germany also.[8] With some changes in detail these resolutions were carried out and on January 1, 1858, the first issue of the Kirchen-Blatt appeared and thereafter the synod at last had its own organ.[9]

---

[7] Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., May 28, 1856. The committee consisted of Grossmann, Deindoerfer and S. Fritschel. Chronik, 17, records the action of the convention, stating in regard to Missouri: "sich sonderlich, was den Kampf mit der Synode von Missouri anlangt, alles Hin- und Herstreitens enthalten als welches meist statt naeher zusammen, weiter auseinander fuehrt u. den Gemeinden das Lesen eines Blattes bald zum Ekel macht."

[8] Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Wartburg November 2-4, 1857. The offer accepted came from a printer in Detroit and was probably secured through S. Fritschel, who had gone there shortly after being named on the committee. The price for 500 copies in the size of K. M. was $6.75. It was decided to charge an annual subscription fee of $.40, pastors to secure payments from members in advance. Since this seemed a high price in Germany, subscribers there were to pay only actual costs, unless they wished to pay in full. An offer to print a larger size for $10 was rejected.

Although there was a sufficiently auspicious beginning to induce the convention of 1858 to resolve to double the size,[10] numerous difficulties soon arose. Irregularities in publication time and typographical imperfections caused several changes of printers.[11] Meeting the increased printing costs of the larger editions seems also to have caused trouble.[12] When S. Fritschel went to Europe in 1861 he presented among other causes the need for a synodical printery. He secured funds for the purchase of a press. The seminary bought other equipment and G. Fritschel spent several weeks with a printer in Madison to acquire technical skill and then trained seminary students to assist him. Beginning in 1862 the Kirchen-Blatt was printed for a number of years in the first synodical printery at Wartburg.[13] The subscription list was not large, but it grew slowly. Receipts, however, during the war years, had become inadequate to meet costs which were probably increased by inflationary trends. Undoubtedly this factor played a part in the decision to establish a synodical printery, which rather precariously seems to have paid its way.[14]

---

[9] The conference had decided that the first issue should appear in December 1857. It appeared under the imprint of a firm in Detroit, but after six issues the printing was done by a firm in Madison, Wisconsin. The subscription price was $.35, K. B. I, 1. Pages were not numbered until well into Vol. II.

[10] Chronik, 25. Each issue of Vol. I had four pages, thereafter the number was eight. The subscription price was raised to $.50.

[11] K. B. III, 1, 8, carried a notice calling attention to a change of printer and hoping that with it irregularities would cease. Paper and printing were poor under the new firm in Galena and before the year was over a Dubuque firm was doing the printing.

[12] Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, January 8-9, 1861. Dietz had written that better service was promised, but half the costs must be paid promptly each month and agreed to handle arrangements if $8.00 were always promptly sent. The Ausschuss agreed to this, arranging to borrow from other treasuries if necessary, and sent a letter to all pastors to urge increased circulation and prompt payments.

Editorial policy repeatedly became a subject of discussion in ministerial conferences. In 1859 the editors expressed hesitation in regard to publication of materials bearing on the chiliast controversy. The conference agreed that such articles should appear only rarely to avoid giving the impression that this was synod's chief interest.[15] In 1862 the conference seconded complaints that the Kirchen-Blatt was not sufficiently popular in tone. The contents were acknowledged to be excellent, but lay readers complained that they were beyond them. This fact impeded greater circulation. The conference agreed that a need was making itself felt for a separate theological magazine for pastors and that when this became feasible there should be a change of editors. Until then, however, editorial policy should be altered and the contents should consist primarily of briefer essays popularily written to suit the needs of lay readers. Pastors too should make more contributions and local conferences were to consider this when they assigned papers; suitable contributions might be sent in for publication.[16]

---

[13] The first issue to bear the imprint of the seminary printery is that of July 1862. K. M. 1863, 3, 23, reports acquisition of the printing press through the generosity of Russian friends, and mentions that students did the printing. Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 114, indicates that G. Fritschel learned the printing trade at Madison.

[14] Kirchen-Blatt books, 1859-67, in Iowa Synod Financial Records. There are three of them giving subscription lists and accounts. No data for the first year are contained in them and none are very clear. By the writer's calculations there were ninety-one subscribers for a total of 374 subscriptions in 1859. Pastors usually ordered numerous copies for the congregations which seem to have been sent to the pastor. By 1862 there were 140 subscribers for 455 subscriptions, thereafter the confusion increases, so that it is difficult to give numbers. For 1859 receipts are listed as $166.74 against expenditures of $163.42. In 1860 both income and expenses fell off a little and there was a deficit, which increased in 1861 to a total of $68.10. By 1864 a balance of $59.96 was shown. Through the three next years monthly accounting showed balances or deficits at different times, in December 1867 a balance of $2.06 was at hand. At a conference in 1859 Deindoerfer complained of lagging payments and stated that the paper could have only a precarious existence under these conditions. Every pastor was requested to pay promptly and to help increase the circulation, Protokollbuch, Minutes Min. Conf., Galena, September 16-20, 1859.

Such suggestions were accepted and although theological papers were never entirely eliminated an attempt was made to make the paper appeal to lay readers. By 1864 the Kirchen-Blatt was well established and the convention again considered an increase in size, which however, had to be postponed to more auspicious times. It also resolved to enlarge the printery, the capital to be secured from individual pastors. Enlarged, it was hoped that it might be able to print books for use in parochial schools and to yield profits, which were assigned to the treasury of the seminary for the benefit of the library.[17]

---

[15] Chronik, 28. Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Wartburg, March 24-28, 1859. Chiliasm was never stressed heavily. The conference also made a number of suggestions, such as articles on dancing and secret societies, with which the editors later complied.

[16] Ibid., Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862. Pastor Schueller made the complaint and there was agreement from all sides. Pastor Hoerlein suggested a series of historical articles on the origin of the seminary, which subsequently appeared and of which use has been made in this book.

Providing books for use in church and school was a problem throughout the decade. The exclusive emphasis on the German language required books in that language.[18] It was difficult, however, to secure books from Germany, especially in small quantities and many German books were not adapted to

---

[17] List, Zusammenstellung 1864.

[18] The paragraph in the constitution for congregations which required the exclusive use of German has been noted in chapter V. As late as 1864 the synod in the constitution of that year officially adopted the name die deutsche...Synode von Iowa. In 1861 a discussion of the congregational constitution in the Kirchen-Blatt on the relevant article remarked that there was no objection to learning English, indeed it was taught in the seminary and in some parochial schools, but in the church German should be retained. In defense it quoted at length from Loehe. German immigrants valued their language less than those of any other race, yet it was the most beautiful of all languages. Exchanging it for English meant to trade wealth for poverty, symphony for cacophony (Wohllaut fuer Uebellaut), form for shadow. With the German language they would lose their history, a ready understanding of the Reformation, the German Bible, their hymns, catechisms, sermon collections, devotional books and liturgy, their entire literature, sacred and profane, their fathers' thought and manner, as well as the respect of their contemporaries at home and abroad. And gain in return--what?

American needs.[19] Other German churches in America had begun to meet similar problems by issuing their own publications, but the synod was not yet strong enough to do this and its relations with other church bodies were either too inchoate or too hostile to make reliance on them feasible. A hymnal was a particularly urgent need. If congregations lacked these books it was necessary for the pastor to recite the verses and for the congregation to catch them and then repeat them in song.[20] During the period of the friendship with Buffalo an attempt was made to put out a hymnal for joint use of the two synods. There were difficulties, because different liturgies were in use, but ways and means were sought to overcome them.[21] The hymnal was delayed but was ready by the time that the synods parted ways and some congregations introduced it. The synod as such, however, never officially recommended its use and was not altogether satisfied with it.[22] A ministerial conference in 1859 undertook consideration of the preparation of a hymnal by and for the synod, asked local conferences to study the matter and named a committee to take charge and bring suggestions.[23] Publication, however, did not prove feasible, for one of the committee members submitted a report to the convention of 1860 on basis of which adoption of a German hymnal was resolved and S. Fritschel was instructed to negotiate with the publisher during his visit in Europe.[24] At the next convention the latter reported that he had been unable to secure acceptable terms and another German book, *Unverfaelschter Liedersegen* was substituted and recommended to the congregations who were, however, to be left free to choose other books, if they so desired.[25]

---

[19] In 1855 the synod inquired from the Gesellschaft, whether a catechism, Loehe's Hausbuch, could be reprinted for it in a cheaper edition in larger type. The reply was that a new edition would entail considerable expense and react adversely on sales of the older edition. It could be undertaken only if heavy sales were in prospect. The existing edition could be furnished considerably cheaper unbound, but the publisher was willing to do this only if large quantities were ordered on a cash basis. See a letter, Wucherer - --, Noerdlingen, December 17, 1855. The books seem to have been ordered, for Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862, refers to difficulties which the seminary had in regard to collecting payment for catechisms which it had ordered from Germany.

[20] A letter, Brueckner - Grossmann, March 9, 1863, in I. S. D., inquiring about hymnals, remarks that his congregation was tired of this method.

[21] The synod at the second convention in 1855, chose the Buffalo hymnal over that of Missouri, and asked Grabau to accept Loehe as coeditor for a liturgical section, which in books destined for Iowa would be substituted for the Buffalo liturgy, K. M. 1856, 6-7, 51, 52. Letters, Grabau - Grossmann, March 13 and May 27, 1856, in I. S. D. discuss costs, printing in America or Germany and mention that the Iowa order of service, submitted for the purpose could be stapled to the

---

book. It was a new edition of an existing hymnal.

[22] A letter, Grabau - Deindoerfer, April 6, 1858, in I. S. D. reports that they were ready and apologizes for misprints. Deindoerfer, *Geschichte*, 105, states that it had numbers of Latin hymns which were useless.

[23] *Protokollbuch*, Minutes, Min. Conf., Wartburg, March 24-28, 1859. The committee consisted of Grossmann, the two Fritschels and Burk. *Chronik*, 29, however, reports that the *Ausschuss* late in May found the project impracticable, because of the expense involved, but was favorably inclined toward a school hymnal.

[24] *Chronik*, 40. Burk made the report. The hymnal chosen was published by Pastor Crome in Prussia, the title is not given.

[25] *Ibid.*, 54; *Synodalbericht 1861*, 39. *Chronik* states that instructions were given to order it immediately.

Though a quasi-official hymnal thus at last existed, it never came into general use. Not without difficulty a shipment was received, but it was quickly exhausted. The inflation of the dollar then increased the price so greatly, that it became impossible to continue the connection.[26] Many congregations in the meantime had adopted their own hymnals, German and American, so that for time a considerable variety was in use.[27] The convention of 1864 resolved to meet the situation by the publication of a small school hymnal, which congregations might use also, until the Liedersegen should again become available at a reasonable price. A number of editors were elected, who discharged their duty, for in the next year the synodical printery issued the book, in exact conformity with the instructions.[28]

---

[26] Pastor Dietz apparently agreed to act as agent. A letter, Dietz - Grossmann, January 30, 1863, in I. S. D. accounts for 425 books, but is not clear as to the size of the total order. According to a letter, M. Loehe - --, June 12, 13, 1862, in I. S. D. the order was handled through the treasurer of the Gesellschaft in Germany; the letter mentions an order for 600 copies, but accounts for only 500. Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862, indicates that the books were ordered on credit, but that there were no funds for freight charges and taxes. It was resolved to borrow the necessary amount from the Pfarrwitwenkasse, but to remind pastors to pay more promptly than in the Hausbuch case. Brueckner's letter cited in footnote 20 voices disappointment on March 9, 1863, that all books were gone and inquires whether it would be wise to select a different book rather than wait for a reorder. Synodalbericht 1864, 42, reports that the book had become expensive, but List's Zusammenstellung 1864 notes that G. Fritschel was instructed to negotiate further with the publisher for such pastors as wished to order the Liedersegen and that further borrowings from the same treasury were authorized for the purpose. Since the original order had been received on credit, it seems probable that the sinking value of the dollar had caused difficulty in payment.

[27] Parochialberichte 1865, nineteen congregations reporting in this rubric, list five using the Liedersegen exclusively and two more which used it as well as another hymnal. One listing, "the new one," may also refer to it. The Buffalo hymnal was used by seven alone or in conjunction with others. Three used the Missouri hymnal, two other German hymnals were listed, Raumer and the Bavarian, the latter being used exclusively in one congregation. Since the report is far from complete, the variety may have been even greater.

A catechism also authorized in 1864 was likewise published by the printery and remained in use. In regard to other school books and texts it was much more difficult to undertake publication, and it was to be some time until synod was strong enough to do this. A ministerial conference in 1859 had named a committee to study the needs of the schools and to make recommendations.[29] The convention of 1860, made a number of recommendations, choosing both American and German works, but this problem was to recur often.[30] Availability of books was another problem. Individual orders from various sources, even from Germany, were slow and bothersome. The ministerial conference in 1859 considered the possibility of setting up a book store, which might carry schoolbooks and a variety of Christian literature. It apparently did not consider a venture by the synod as such, but instructed a pastor to open negotiations with a business man to this end.[31] Nothing of the kind, however, came into being during the first decade. The synod had little other occasion to venture into the publications field, though it should be noted that reports of three of its conventions, 1858, 1861, and 1864, were printed. They are disappointing from the point of view of affording a complete and reliable account of the business transacted, because they served primarily as a vehicle for the publication of the papers and doctrinal discussions which were dealt with at these gatherings. They seem to have been read widely and were destined to be cited often and for years to come in controversial questions.

---

[28] Synodalbericht 1864, 42. Grossmann, G. Fritschel and Deindoerfer were elected editors, they were to select approximately 150 hymns and were to append a special index giving the numbers of the hymns in the Liedersegen. The books with exactly 150 hymns and the double index was published under the title, Geistliche Lieder fuer Schule und Haus.

[29] Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Wartburg, March 24-28, 1859. Klindworth and Grossmann were chosen. They apparently functioned only until the next synod, when they made the recommendations noted.

[30] Chronik, 40. A German reader and an arithmetic were published in St. Louis and were Missouri publications. Four

A historical record of great importance was undertaken when the second convention ordered the maintenance of the Synodalchronik and chose Deindoerfer to keep it.[32] The latter carried it back to 1853 and submitted it to a ministerial conference in 1857, which directed that parochial reports, conference minutes, and reports of synodical officers should be made available as materials. In addition on other occasions

---

other recommendations were published in Germany, one by Bauer for instruction in German, also a writing book and secular and biblical histories.

[31] The minutes cited in footnote 29. The business man suggested was from Madison and may have been a member of the congregation there.

[32] Chronik, 12.

of importance the pastors involved were to notify the chronicler directly. Since Deindoerfer was in close touch with synodical affairs, he was able to keep a thorough and informative record throughout the decade.[33] To Deindoerfer also went the assignment of writing a Denkschrift, part historical summary and part exposition of synod's Richtung for the tenth anniversary, which was read at the anniversary celebration at the convention of 1864 and later published in Germany.[34]

There were beginnings also of charitable or eleemosynary undertakings. Mention has been made of the Pfarrwitwenkasse through which pastors were gradually to accumulate a fund for the support of widows. The convention of 1861 also adopted a number of resolutions relating to the support of ill or indigent pastors. It asked congregations whose pastors were disabled by reason of age or illness to retain and support them. If there were neighboring pastors they were to cooperate in serving the congregation. If not, an assistant was to be furnished and if the salary were not adequate to support both him and the pastor, a special offering was to be lifted in all congregations. If a pastor lost his position due to the dissolution of the congregation which he was serving, his brethren in the ministry were asked to grant him hospitality and he in turn was to assist them, until a new position could be found for him.[35]

---

[33] Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Wartburg, November 2-4, 1857.

[34] Denkschrift 10. Synodalbericht 1864 credits it to Deindoerfer and notes its reading on the anniversary day, while List Zusammenstellung 1864 records a resolution asking the fathers in Germany to publish it.

In 1854 Loehe and the Gesellschaft had offered the Michigan property and colonization fund invested there as an endowment for the seminary.[36] The synod did not, however, accept this gift, because it involved liquidation of the property, which was difficult from a distance and because it could not expect the cooperation of a pastor of the Missouri Synod who was managing the properties for Loehe. Liquidation ran into difficulties and was long delayed.[37] Loehe seems to have kept his purpose in mind in the earlier years, for in 1857 a fund of $200 was assigned for the endowment of a chair at the seminary.[38] Even this amount, however, was never paid and by 1862 Loehe had changed his mind and informed the *Ausschuss* that the *Pilgerhaus* had been sold, but that he wished most of the colonization capital to be used for the establishment of an eleemosynary foundation with broad purposes at St. Sebald and asked for specific suggestions.[39] The convention of 1861 had in the meantime given consideration to a project for the establishment of a hospital for Lutheran pastors.[40] The *Ausschuss* resolved to recommend this project to Loehe with the suggestion that its purposes could perhaps be broadened, so that his fundamental purpose, to serve bodily

---

[35] Chronik, 52-3.

[36] Letter, Loehe - Grossmann, September 16, 1854, type copy in I. S. D.; K. M. 1854, 12, 96. A portion, however, was set aside for the endowment of parishes. It had been Loehe's original purpose to use the entire amount for the latter purpose, Ibid., 1853, 12, 96.

[37] There are various references to this matter in K. M., but only the final report need be cited, which appeared in Correspondenzblatt 1866, XVII, 6 and 7, 21-2. Title was twice contested and settlements had to be made. There were further losses due to the low exchange value of the dollar, when the capital was returned to Germany. It should be noted that Pastor Sievers of the Missouri Synod handled a vexatious matter faithfully even though it required considerable advances at times from his own and synodical funds and that Missouri gave him permission to advance the latter, K. M. 1858, 5 and 6, 45.

[38] Letter, Loehe - S. Fritschel, Neuendettelsau, June 5, 1857, type copy in I. S. D. This amount was given by Sophie von Tucher and may not have been part of the coloniza-

---

tion fund. *Protokollbuch*, *Ausschuss* Minutes, April 20, 1861, mentions it as invested in Frankenmut land and states that no interest had been received. It was resolved to call the loan and ask for interest past due. *Chronik*, 45, refers to it as given by Miss von Tucher to the *seminary*. It was never collected and there was considerable difficulty later after Loehe's death over attempts to collect it. Klindworth later charged S. Fritschel with trying to collect it twice and the defense made by the latter indicates both that the seminary never received the endowment and that pastor Sievers had refused to manage the liquidation of the property for the Iowa Synod. *Bericht ueber die auf Anlass der Schrift Pastor Klindworth's "Die traurigen Zustaende in der Iowa-Synode" veranstaltete Untersuchung*, 79-80. This pamphlet will hereafter be cited as *Bericht*...*Untersuchung*.

[39] *Protokollbuch*, *Ausschuss* Minutes, April 28, 1862. Just what was in Loehe's mind is not clear, but the institution was to serve general and not local purposes.

[40] *Chronik*, 52. This also lacks details, but the account cited in footnote 43 indicates that the intention was to buy land and maintain a home; it is, however, called a hospital both in *Chronik* and by the *Ausschuss*.

needs of Lutheran Christians, could be met.[41] Although a ministerial conference subsequently endorsed this proposal,[42] Loehe rejected it, because he did not wish to have the original purpose of the fund, colonization, ignored entirely. He invested the capital in Germany instead and designated the interest for the support of new missions, preferably in forest regions on the frontier. If no calls for help from such congregations came in, it might be used to support Reiseprediger. The fund was to be maintained intact and applied for similar purposes in other lands, after America no longer needed it.[43] When the fund was finally established, support of Reiseprediger seems to have been forgotten again. The income was to be used to supply new churches with altar vessels and vestments.[44]

---

[41] Ausschuss Minutes, April 28, 1862. Loehe had not made his purposes very clear, but the Ausschuss saw no need for whatever it was that he had proposed. It regretted that it had failed to communicate the 1861 resolution to him at the time. It was, however, ready to give further consideration to his proposal, if he were to reject the proposal which it made.

[42] Ibid., Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862.

[43] K. B. VII, 7, 55-6. It appears from this account that the capital invested was only partially liquidated as yet, but that the remainder was to be added to the fund as it came in. Grossmann regretted that the home project could not be realized, but looked forward to receiving $80 annually for Reiseprediger in a few years.

[44] Freimund, 1866, 26, 212. This account adds that occasionally assistance toward building churches might be given. According to the K. B. Loehe had suggested particularly the furnishing of churches and parsonages on the frontier. Correspondenzblatt XVI, 6 and 7, 21-2, confirms the account in Freimund, but mentions only altar furnishings. Both accounts indicate that liquidation was complete and that the capital had been returned to Germany. Freimund estimated the annual interest at about $80.

If the colonization capital thus was applied to other purposes, the suggestion to make provision for ill or disabled pastors was not altogether ignored by Loehe. In 1864 he remitted a bequest of 1,000 Gulden ($400) to the synod to be invested for such purposes with detailed suggestions for organization and management. A board of trustees to consist of himself and three American members was to serve for life with the right vested in each member to appoint a successor. The fund was to be invested in land, preferably at St. Sebald, one-third of the proceeds to be added to the fund annually and two-thirds to go to the support of four specified classes of eligible applicants, with the provision that if there were no applicants, the entire income was to be added to the fund. The American members were to make suggestions in regard to organization and the fund was to be entirely independent of the synod, after it grew sufficiently large aid might be given to non-members also. If the organization were ever disbanded, disposition of the fund was to rest entirely with Loehe or his successor.[45] With only minor changes the Gademann Society was formed according to these suggestions and articles of incorporation were prepared in 1866.[46]

---

[45] *K*. *B*. VII, 7, 56. Loehe named his brother Max as his successor, and suggested Grossmann, Deindoerfer, and Amman as American members. Taxes and other charges reduced the fund to $371.39 and no support payments were to be made until it had grown to $400 again. Indian missionaries of the Iowa synod constituted the first class eligible for support, if sick or disabled; pastors who had colonized or formed frontier congregations the second; *Reiseprediger* who had succeeded in founding congregations the third; other pastors who had carried on mission work among Germans the fourth. Aid was not to be offered, but given only on application. An American member was to act as treasurer. Changes might be made in detail, but the main features were to stand. The name suggested was *Gademannscher Emeritenfond*.

Mention has been made in an earlier chapter of a policy of promoting local charity in individual congregations. There are no records to show what individual congregations did in this respect. In a few places, however, institutions of mercy developed out of local charitable work. It seems likely that local relief dealt with cases of individual poverty and particularly with widows and orphans. At any rate it was the plight of individual orphans which led to institutional undertakings. The civil war years produced many individual tragedies which left orphaned and destitute children who challenged Christian charity and thus undoubtedly provided an impetus which made projects to establish orphanages feasible. The first beginnings, however, slightly antedated the war.

---

[46] By-laws of the Gademann Society and Articles of Incorporation of the Gademann Society, the latter attested November 20, 1866, are in the S. Fritschel Documents. The most important change was that only Loehe was a life member with the right of choosing his own successor. The American trustees were to be elected annually by the members of the society. Loehe and successors had a right of veto on all actions of the American trustees. The trustees were to elect a president, secretary, and treasurer from their number. These provisions, however, and the details in regard to aid were in the by-laws which were made amendable, provided they conformed with the constitution. The Articles declared themselves to be a constitution and fixed the number of trustees, five, with G. Fritschel added to Loehe's choices, the purpose in general terms, the name, and gave authority to establish by-laws, providing that a majority of trustees formed a quorum. No provision for amendment was contained in the constitution. Since the by-laws were required to be in conformity with the constitution, the provision which gave Loehe veto power over the constitutional quorum would seem to have been of doubtful validity. The incorporation does not seem to have consummated.

Pastor Doerfler, located at Toledo in an industrial city, in which undoubtedly the panic of 1857 had produced distress among laboring classes, conceived the idea of founding an orphanage in 1859. The Catholic Church maintained an orphanage outside of Toledo and Doerfler noted that this institution accepted non-Catholic children, which it reared in the Catholic faith. There was also a local group of women which rented a building not far from Salem Church and took in some twenty orphans, the majority of whom were of German parentage, but it had to abandon the undertaking and the children had to be distributed at random. Moved by such factors Doerfler with relatives and members of his congregation in 1860 acquired a tract of ten acres a few miles to the eastward of Toledo for the purpose of founding an orphanage there. Reporting this acquisition to Loehe, he noted that plans for construction were underway and asked whether Loehe could furnish aid. He also asked for a deaconess to serve the cause and suggested that later a hospital might be added on the model of Passavant's institutions at Pittsburgh and Zelionople.[47]

---

[47] K. M. 1862, 4, 28-31, brought a letter, Doerfler - Loehe, August 3, 1860, which contained this information. The idea originated in a discussion between Doerfler and Schmidt in 1859. The land purchase was suggested in connection with the foundation of the Filiale eastward of Toledo to which Beckel was later called. The congregation liked the tract, but could not afford it and later bought a smaller part of it for its own purposes. The cost was $350. S. Poppen, Goldenes Jubilaeum. Geschichte des Luth. Waisenhauses zu Toledo, Ohio, 1860-1910, 10, indicates that H. H. Samson, F. and H. Doerfler, Ch. Rudolf and H. Blankemeier formed a corporation as an orphanage society in 1860. Doerfler does not give names but indicates that this group gave or raised the money for the purchase.

At the time when the adjacent orphanage broke up, Doerfler took two of the boys into his own home. Subsequently he took in three more and still later yet two more. During 1861 plans were made for the construction of a frame building and the collection of funds was undertaken and late in the year construction began.[48] With most of the money coming from Toledo, the building was completed and dedicated in 1862.[49] The seven children for whom Doerfler had cared were transferred to the orphanage. Doerfler remained in charge and had intended to take up his residence in the orphanage, while remaining pastor of Salem Church. This arrangement, however, was unsatisfactory and Pastor Beckel was called to take charge of the

---

[48] K. M. 1862, 4, 31-2; 5 and 6, 33-5, contains a letter from Kroenke, dated November 28, 1861, which gives this information and estimates building costs at $1,500 noting that there was much enthusiasm, but that it was difficult to raise so large a sum. To the future projects this letter added a deaconess mother house. Poppen, Geschichte, 10, indicates that the two first boys taken in by Doerfler came from the dissolved orphanage.

[49] K. M. 1863, 1, 6-8, brings part of a letter, Doerfler - Bauer, May 29, 1862, which states that by far the larger part of the money was raised in Doerfler's congregation. His letter in 1860 had indicated that much work would be donated by his members, but he does not mention this again. The total cost is not given, nor is there any mention of a debt. Poppen, Geschichte, 29, gives the amounts raised 1860-62 as $774.69, which would have left a considerable debt, but it is possible that he refers to maintenance costs. Later, in 1865, Doerfler mentioned payment of debts amounting to $1,300 and referred to a remaining debt of $850, K. M. 1865, 9, 34. This may have included interest payments. On p. 11 the dedication date is given as July 27, 1862. Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, August 14, 1862, also mentions the dedication and indicates that S. Fritschel attended it.

East side church and the orphanage under Doerfler's supervision. This, too, did not work well, but in 1866 Doerfler resigned at Salem and moved into the institution as resident head.[50] No distinctions were made in regard to children accepted and through the war years the number grew steadily.[51] The orphanage from the beginning sought to gain inter-synodical support, and although it was not in all cases successful, considerable aid was given by congregations and pastors of the Ohio and the Michigan Synods.[52]

---

[50] Poppen, Geschichte, 11, notes the transfer of the children and that Miss Katharina Blankemeier, who had previously assisted in the care of the children in Doerfler's home, temporarily took charge as house mother, assisted by her mother. On p. 12 he noted Doerfler's resignation and removal in 1866. A letter, Kroenke - Grossmann, St. Michael's Day, 1861, in I. S. D. noted Doerfler's original intention, but was doubtful whether it would be feasible. Doerfler then applied to the Ausschuss for an assistant in the congregation, intending to serve as pastor from the orphanage. The congregation would have preferred his resignation, so that it could call another pastor, or his complete renunciation of the management of the orphanage, but agreed to call an assistant and did so. Doerfler then changed his mind and arranged for Beckel's dual position, but under his own supervision at the orphanage. Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, November 5, 1861; January 9-10; April 28; August 14; September 29, 1862. A letter, Beckel - Grossmann, January 26, 1864, in I. S. D. indicates that supervision by Doerfler meant that the latter took the complete responsibility and thus really occupied two positions as he had originally planned, though not residing at the home.

[51] Poppen, Geschichte gives no year by year figures, but mentions the war, p. 12, and states that there were seventy-five admissions during the first ten years, p. 27. In K. M. 1863, 11 and 12, 93-5, Kroenke reported the transfer of two children from Ottawa Lake to the orphanage. No nationality or creed was given, but the mother bigamously married an Irish laborer and with him deserted the two, ages two and six, in a filthy cabin deep in the woods. The father, in the army, later formally placed the children in the care of the orphanage. They could not speak German when adopted. In 1865 seventy-nine children were in the institution, K. M. 1865, 9, 34.

Pastor Kroenke had written in 1861 that orphanages were needed and feasible in the more densely populated east, but not in the west, where a sparse and poorer population could not support them.[53] Within a few years, however, the Civil War multiplied widows and orphans and the need came to be imperatively felt there, too. In 1863 an Iowa pastor reported to Neuendettelsau that Pastor Schueller was raising funds to found an orphanage and that he had already taken four children, including one girl and one child of pure American parentage into his home.[54] While Pastor Schueller was serving the congregation at Tete des Morts a number of orphans, which increased to seven were brought to him. Several had been orphaned by the war. He accepted them and sought to interest members of his congregation in an orphanage and also to enlist support in the neighborhood. Although he does not seem to have raised large amounts, a number of laymen and pastors joined him in founding a society for the support of the enterprise in 1864 and took steps to become incorporated. A farm of 160 acres near Andrew was acquired and erection of a stone building was begun. It was ready for dedication in the fall of 1864 and Pastor Schueller, who had removed to Andrew, took charge, serving the local congregation and surrounding territory at the same time. A deaconess from Germany served as house mother.[55] The building was as yet unfinished and late in 1864 Schueller reported the children as still housed with himself. Admission policy was to accept orphans and neglected children without distinction of nationality or creed, but only children under twelve. The language of the institution was German, but all children were taught English.[56] Small, struggling, beset by economic worries, the Andrew orphanage was to prove that it was more difficult to maintain such an institution in the west than in the east. It was also destined to prove that it was not impossible.

---

[52] Poppen, Geschichte, 12, gives no dates but notes intersynodical support. Amounts received remained meager through 1864, the maximum being $381.37 in 1862, but increased rapidly beginning in 1865, rising to a high for the first decade of $2,650.37 in 1869 and because of this rise averaging $1,161.06 for the decade. Probably the other synods began contributing steadily from 1865 onward, p. 29. In those years the orphanage was able to buy an additional thirty acres for $3,000, paying $1,000 down while Salem donated a team and wagon, p. 12. An annual orphan festival seems to have been celebrated and become a day of ingathering from the beginning, p. 29. K. M. 1863, 1, 7, seems to indicate that Doerfler tried to get support from other synods even during the building, but not with much success. K. M. 1862, 7, 52-6, reprints an article from Buffalo's Informatorium which considered orphanages an unnecessary outgrowth of pietism, children had better be cared for privately. The venture was merely designed to gain prestige by Iowa and had an odor of unionist practice.

[53] K. M. 1862, 5 and 6, 35.

---

[54] *K*. *M*. 1864, 2, 11. An undated letter from Pastor Stuermer the first part of which appeared in 1 and which must therefore have been written in 1863. In a report in *K*. *B*. VIII, 1, 6-7, Schueller mentioned that he had taken a total of nine children into his family, three of whom were subsequently cared for by relatives or friends. He wrote that derelict children were numerous before the war, but that the war had greatly increased their number. Dietz *Tagebuch* contains an entry for February 1862 which notes that Schueller was planning an orphanage at that time, Dietz without giving reasons was opposed.

[55] The writer has been able to find but few contemporary sources on the beginnings at Andrew. The data since the last footnote are from *Festschrift zum Goldenen Jubilaeum des Waisenhauses zu Waverly, Iowa, 1863-1913*. The orphanage was later removed from Andrew to Waverly. The pamphlet gives no author, signatures at the end indicate that it was prepared by a committee composed of pastors J. Dilges, F. Schaffnit, H. Graening, G. Blessin. Of these Graening was in the seminary at the time of the founding and Blessin arrived in 1871. The other two served as superintendents at later periods.

The Iowa Synod was as yet too small to undertake successfully all the ventures for which it saw needs. With difficulty it maintained its church paper, but it could not yet carry a theological magazine or undertake a variety of desirable or even needful publication and merchandizing enterprises. It could and did initiate measures designed in the

---

The date of the organization of the society is given as May 27, 1864, and apparently steps looking toward incorporation and the purchase of the farm for $1,360 were undertaken at the same time. The dedication took place on September 29, Grossmann performing it. The building was designed to house the superintendent and seventy-five children. As will appear it was not yet ready for occupancy. Lack of means, hinted at throughout, but not indicated by figures prevented completion and equipment of the interior. Debts seem to have accumulated from the start, by 1872 they amounted to $5,000. The deaconess, Sister Marie Hoeflinger, was employed in 1869, K. B. XII, 22, 172. Few names of other supporters appear, only those of Mr. Daudel and Mr. Hankammer from neighboring congregations are mentioned, pp. 6, 7. Stuermer's cited letter mentioned that Galena had contributed $80 and Klindworth over the next few years appears as strongly interested, he may well have been one of the original mainstays.

[56] K. M. 1865, 3 and 4, 19-22, brings a letter, Schueller - Loehe, Andrew, December 6, 1864, which gives these data. He mentions only six children. The dimensions of the building were 60 x 30; it had three stories. Schueller mentions 180 acres of land, but says nothing about finances.

long run to care for aged or ill pastors and their dependents, although one of them was initiated entirely by foreign generosity, but for present needs it was compelled to rely on brotherly charity and it was fortunate that as yet this problem was not pressing. Its orphanages represented an attempt to deal with broader social problems. Neither of them was a synodical enterprise, however. Both originated within the synod and had its approval, but both depended upon private organizations of individual members for their support, and the more successful of the two reached out beyond the confines of the synod.

PART II

1864-1879

CHAPTER XII

WELL-SPRINGS: EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS 1864-1879

The seminary at St. Sebald had gradually attained a measure of stability during the first decade of the Iowa Synod. Internal policy and administration were not to undergo significant changes for some time to come, so far as theological training was concerned. The seminary, however, had never been a purely theological institution. Since it received few students who were properly prepared for theological study it had always been necessary to arrange for preparatory work. Some of the students were boys of fourteen who pursued studies modeled on the curriculum of the German Gymnasium and went into theological training after their completion. Seven or eight years were required to complete both courses, although some of the students could do it in a shorter time, because they entered after having been tutored by pastors and after examination could be placed in an advanced class in the preparatory course. Another type of preparatory work was necessary for older men, for whom entrance requirements were reduced to a minimum, but who, even so, required preliminary training. As a result the seminary really consisted of three departments, a seminary proper, a classical academy and college, and a proseminary.

As early as 1861 the Ausschuss had envisioned an eventual separation. It declared that the goal must be the establishment of a proseminary with two divisions for the practical training of older and the classical education of younger students.[1] The next pastoral conference in 1862 gave much attention to the problems of preparatory work, but took no action toward founding separate institutions. It concerned itself primarily with the needs of the older men and adopted principles in regard to selection, admission and training on basis of which an appropriate curriculum was to be worked out. For the younger men it laid down the requirement of a complete Gymnasium course, suitable for subsequent theological training, but it added specifically that students who did not desire to enter into the direct service of the church, might also be admitted into this department.[2]

---

[1] Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, November 5, 1861.

[2] Ibid., Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862. The discussion was occasioned by a curriculum submitted by S. Fritschel and accompanied by a statement of the preparatory policies described in the first paragraph. The curriculum presented dealt with the needs of the older group. The Ausschuss in the cited session had decided during the preceding semester to stress preparatory training at the expense of theological work, because the student body of the moment needed it. The conference referred the curriculum to the local conference of the seminary area, but directed the Galena Conference, from which the statement of policies came, to send a delegate to the meeting. The statement emphatically endorsed both types of preparatory training, but laid down only the cited direction for the younger group. Older men were to be selected with careful regard for mental capacity, the pastors from whose congregations they came were to see to this and to tutor them in elementary subjects in which they might be deficient. An entrance examination was to determine preparatory needs and to establish the time required to meet them. Minor deficiencies were to be made up privately with the assistance of the pastors. As a rule three semesters of preparatory work were to suffice and foreign languages were not to be unconditionally required. Admission was to take place only at the beginning of a school year, so that courses could be alternated in a sequence. S. Fritschel had suggested the following

The regulations for the training of older men seem to have been put into effect with satisfactory results, at any rate there is no record showing that the next synodical convention made further provisions in this respect. That convention did, however, concern itself with the Gymnasium course for the younger men. Following German ideas on secondary education it provided for a course of five years duration combining high school and college levels according to American standards. The curriculum was worked out in detail and rules and regulations were laid down to govern admission, tuition and fees, and discipline.[3] The convention also adopted or reaffirmed the policy in regard to admission to this course

---

subjects for this older group: biblical history and catechism, German grammar and essays, outlines of history and geography and if possible, Latin and Greek.

[3] K. B. VII, II, 81-2. The curriculum placed religion first and followed with German, English, Latin and Greek. Other subjects were, history, geography, arithmetic, algebra, geometry, logic, rhetoric, and music, theory, vocal, and instrumental. Non-theological students, not taking the full course might be excused from Latin and Greek. Entrance requirements were ability to read and write German and English and confirmation age. Conformity with house rules and Christian conduct under the pastoral care and guidance of the teaching staff were specified and non-compliance and offensive conduct were grounds for dismissal. Tuition charges were $2 a month, inclusive of instruction in music and a fee of $1.50 a week was to cover room, board, firewood and laundry. Since these arrangements were to go into effect on January 1, 1865, it does not seem likely that many non-theological students had entered since 1862. Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 157, states that there were four between 1864 and 1867.

of students who did not have the ministry in mind. It resolved that this information should be published in the Kirchenblatt. Accordingly during the same year that paper carried an extended notice describing the facilities and strongly recommending the preparatory school to parents and prospective students, whether they had the ministry in mind or not.[4]

The seminary had not been able to continue its original function of training teachers for parochial schools after 1854. While some of its early students had begun their studies with that vocation in mind, they had usually changed over to the ministry, sometimes after a period of service as teachers. Teaching had become a regular function of pastors, but they do not seem to have received special training for that purpose. Since most congregations were unable to maintain both pastors and teachers, there was little demand for the latter. The burden of double duty upon the pastor, however, was heavy and by the end of the first decade there was an occasional inquiry as to availability of teachers. It was evident also that there was much truth in Loehe's original thought, that teachers might serve as missionaries by opening Christian schools among the unchurched and thus create openings for gathering congregations.

---

[4] Ibid. This notice points out that the lack of German higher educational facilities in the west necessitated the establishment of such a preparatory school for the seminary and indicates that since it existed, the synod deemed it advisable to let it serve broader purposes and to invite students interested in business or professions, or simply seeking a cultural education, to enroll.

Candidates were sometimes sent to take charge where such requests for schools seemed to offer prospects or assigned as assistants to overburdened pastors, but such arrangements were not wholly satisfactory.[5]

Parochial schools and the teaching problem were also on the agenda of the convention of 1864. A paper stressing the necessity of Christian day schools was ordered published in the Kirchenblatt. The convention further resolved that a school teachers' seminary should be established. Since immediate execution of this provision was out of the question financially, a committee was to study the problem and means of solving it. The committee was authorized provisionally to establish a seminary, provided that it could be done without expense to synod. It was recommended to pastors that they select capable girls and give them private training to enable them to take charge of schools in smaller congregations.[6] There is no record of women subsequently serving in this capacity, and it was not possible at that time to open a seminary.

---

[5] Protokollbuch, Ausschuss Minutes, February 15; April 22, 1864. Doerfler at Toledo asked for a teacher to replace his brother who had left and was given an assistant, who, however, did not long remain in that capacity. In another case a candidate refused a teaching position on the ground that his heart was set on the ministry. In still another case a pastor who could not be supplied with either a teacher or an assistant complained that a Methodist clergyman was ready to supply an opening.

[6] Chronik, 77; Synodalbericht 1864, 41; List Zusammenstellung 1864 in I. S. D.; K. B. VII, 12, 89. Inquiry was to be made among congregations in regard to their interest in the proposed teachers' seminary and it was to be located in the congregation making the best offer. There is no record of an offer.

Since the synod, however, continued to stress parochial schools, the need for teachers continued to grow and become more pressing, so that the problem persisted and came before the synod from time to time during the following years. A number of years were to pass, however, before the seminary could be provided.

The provisions of 1862 and 1864 had established well-defined curricula and regulations for the two preparatory courses, but separation of the preparatory school from the seminary had not been considered seriously. During the next few years there was sufficient growth in the enrollment to suggest this development. While total numbers were not large[7] they crowded the limited facilities at Wartburg so that some additional construction had taken place and more was needed. In part the growth was due to arrangements, in force for a brief period though expected to be lasting, with other Lutheran church bodies for accepting students to be trained for them.[8] Difficulties were also developing in regard to discipline. It was not easy to enforce when students of different age levels were housed together in crowded accommodations, especially since periods occurred when the synodical obligations and duties of the teachers interfered with the regularity of instruction.[9] The presence of a few non-theological students may have been a contributing factor.

---

[7] Chronik, 88, gives the number in 1868 as thirty, fifteen each in the theological and the preparatory courses.

[8] In 1867 a rapprochement with the Illinois Synod took place, which will be discussed later. According to Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 157, it sent seven students in 1867 who withdrew after another year. Due to arrangements with two other German groups, also to be noted later, more students from Germany were also expected. These expectations were realized to some degree. A kitchen and a printery had been added to the seminary and an addition to the residence for professors had been built, Chronik, 88.

These conditions had not yet become acute when the next convention met in 1867 at Toledo. The synod contented itself with making provisions for financing an expected influx of students from Germany and deferred proposals for establishing a separate college, as well as a teachers' seminary in view of then pending establishment of the General Council. An offer looking toward the acquisition of a suitable property in Galena for educational purposes was referred to a committee which was to look it over and, if suitable, to try to induce private persons to secure an option for synod.[10]

---

[9] Ibid. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Toledo, February 9, 1869, in I. S. D. refers to disciplinary problems in the immediately preceding years and indicates that ugly rumors were circulating, which were injurious to the reputation of the seminary. Doctrinal controversy took much of the time of the professors in 1866 and 1867.

[10] Information on action taken in regard to education by the convention of 1867 is rather scanty. Doctrinal issues were in the foreground and receive most attention in the accounts in the Chronik and the K. B. The latter reports the convention much less thoroughly than usual, because a printed report was authorized, which was never issued. The data are from Zusammenstellung der Beschluesse der im Jahr 1867 zu Toledo versammelten Synode von Iowa, a document in I. S. D. compiled by Secretary List from the official minutes which as usual are not extant. The financing of German students is not explained, it may have related to extraordinary travel costs. A special appeal for funds was authorized and collectors were to be appointed. A committee was also to be named to promote better attendance domestically. The antecedents and character

During the ensuing year, however, the enrollment at Wartburg was almost doubled and when a further large increase was in prospect for the following year, the situation became acute. It was necessary either to build at Wartburg, or to separate the preparatory school from the seminary and locate it elsewhere.[11] Largely for this reason a special convention of the synod was called to meet at Madison in 1868.[12]

At this session, both possibilities had their adherents, but the debate centered around a proposal to separate the

---

of the Galena opportunity are not explained, a statement that the seminary was not to be moved before the next convention might indicate that what was under consideration was not separation, but removal from St. Sebald. A copy of the *Zusammenstellung*, annotated in Grossmann's hand in regard to enforcement and also in I. S. D., indicates that collectors were appointed, but made no report and that the committee on attendance did not function, but that enrollment grew to capacity nevertheless. The building in Galena was not bought, because the price was too high. It also explains that the printed report was not issued, because urgent duties prevented the committee in charge from preparing it in time.

[11] The enrollment had increased to the already cited figure of thirty and twenty applications for admission were on file, *Chronik*, 87; *K*. *B*. XI, 15, 120; 19, 145.

[12] Notice calling the convention appears, *K*. *B*. XI, 15, 120, noting the prospective enrollment which necessitated decisions that only a convention could make, cf. 21, 167. There were unfavorable reactions. Objections were that short notice made it difficult to raise travel funds and that proposals of far-reaching importance should not be decided on short notice, at least they should be published for preliminary consideration. The notice appeared in the issue for August 1, the convention met September 16-23. The Eastern Conference decided to send two delegates (Deindoerfer and Beckel) to represent it. See letters, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Toledo, August 29, 1868; Lutz - Grossmann, Fort Madison, August 20; September 1, 1868, in I. S. D. To some degree both writers seem to have expressed conference sentiments.

preparatory school from the seminary and to locate it at Galena. The chief advocate of this course was Pastor Klindworth of that city.[13] He stressed the advantages of separating younger and older students and also those of an urban over against a rural environment.[14] He also presented a definite plan, involving acquisition of a suitable property in Galena, which could be bought cheaply; a limited enrollment at the outset, which could be served by one instructor, suggesting an available man; and proposals for raising the necessary funds by an energetically conducted synodical appeal and by borrowing idle Indian mission funds. Motions embodying Klindworth's plan and proposing a college building at St. Sebald were both offered and referred to a committee. The latter brought in a recommendation favoring separation and relocation at Galena. While this was being discussed a letter was received from a pastor of the Illinois Synod suggesting that the seminary or some part of it be relocated at Beardstown and promising generous support from the locality in case of acceptance. Thus there were three possibilities and opinions were apparently divided with advocates of all three urging their viewpoints. Deindoerfer finally suggested provisional location at Galena, pending an investigation of the advantages of the Beardstown location, and this was adopted. Rental of the Galena property was then suggested, but Klindworth proposed that several individuals in Galena would buy the property at their own risk, if the synod would lend $1,500 in mission funds without interest. This also was accepted.[15]

---

[13] Chronik, 87, indicates that Klindworth was primarily responsible for the decision to locate at Galena and this is borne out by the report in the K. B. to be cited in footnote 15. A letter, Deindoerfer - Bauer, Defiance, May 11, 1871, remarks that Klindworth's characteristic persistence carried the day. Klindworth himself accepted responsibility, Klindworth, Zu einem Zeugniss ueber sie!, 40-1.

[14] Chronik, 87, states that disciplinary reasons accounted for the separation. Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 55-6, also gives them as the motive, stating that they were a delicate subject to be touched on lightly. The K. B. report to be cited uses positive terms, advantages of separating the two groups and does not hint of criticism and also makes the only mention of the urban-rural argument, but it seems clear that there was dissatisfaction with disciplinary conditions at Wartburg. S. Fritschel reporting on the seminary reported that some admonitions had been necessary, but that students were receptive, no expulsions had been necessary and mentions good conduct and a satisfactory relationship between faculty and students, K. B. XI, 21, 165. Grossmann's presidential report, however, alluded to much illness affecting S. Fritschel during the year, Ibid., 162.

---

[15] K. B. XI, 21, 167-8. The committee appointed in 1867 to look into the Galena property was considered in charge. It did not, however, immediately bring in a recommendation. Instead the entire question was debated by the convention. The Klindworth proposal was offered as a resolution. The opposing motion to erect a building for the college together with the Klindworth motion then went back to the committee. The report states that the second motion proposed to erect a building in Galena which would seem to be an error. The committee resolution endorsing Galena was based on the disciplinary advantages of separation and on the consideration that a building and an additional instructor would also be needed at Wartburg. Overcrowding of facilities thus was the basic difficulty, while disciplinary factors tipped the balance in favor of separation so far as the committee was concerned. S. Fritschel's report in the same issue, p. 165, makes it clear that the increase in students occurred during the preceding year. Attendance had almost tripled, with six admissions from within synod, five from Germany and seven from the

Since educational finances at the time were in fairly good order,[16] the convention also sought to make arrangements

---

Illinois Synod. The report also mentions a large number of applications for the coming year, but does not give a number. The Beardstown proposal seems to have exerted considerable influence. Deindoerfer's letter, cited in footnote 13, indicates that it may have tipped the balance in favor of separation in the convention. Since the Illinois Synod soon swung into the wake of Missouri the provisional character of the Galena location soon lost all significance and Beardstown dropped out of the picture. Deindoerfer may have been speaking for himself, for he seems to have favored Wartburg up to the time when the Beardstown offer came up, but he carried considerable weight. Even so the majority in favor of Galena was slim and the opposition had been strong. Klindworth was later to charge the brothers Fritschel with selfish opposition, a charge which was denied. These contentions may be found in Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 55-6, and Zeugniss, 40-1, and in Bericht...Untersuchung, 42-3. They were raised years afterward and represent special pleadings, but the conjecture may be justified that the Fritschels were inclined to favor separation for disciplinary reasons, but were fearful of financial difficulties. The private arrangement for the acquisition of the Galena property was carried out only in part and was to cause much difficulty later. Klindworth in the source first cited declared that the property could be bought for not more than $3,000, the actual price was $2,500, K. B. XI, 22, 175. It may be added that the man, whom Klindworth suggested as instructor, Pastor F. Lutz, whose position at Fort Madison had become untenable, was engaged. The enrollment limitation proposed was twenty, beyond that another instructor would be required, who, however, would be needed anyway as the students advanced and should be a well trained man. The synod adopted no specific name, but resolved to call the institution das Kollegium.

[16] Since the books were not preserved, no reliable financial picture can be drawn. Since the Gesellschaft had taken over the old German debt in 1863 this debt though probably not yet extinguished was no longer a burden for the seminary. Operational deficits as previously noted were usually covered by borrowing from the seminary's endowment fund. Since no statement for this fund exists prior to 1871, no statement can be made as to the situation in 1868. Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 157, mentions a deficit of $630 in 1867, which presumably was met in this way. K. B. XI, 21, 164, brings a financial report for 1867-68 which shows receipts, $5,506.40, and expenditures, $5,574.90, with a deficit of $68.50.

to keep them so. While avoiding a synodical commitment to buy the Galena property at least for the present, a sum of $1,000 was appropriated for repairs and construction at Wartburg, where facilities were still likely to be taxed. To meet this and the running expenses at Galena it was resolved to maintain the regular system of offerings and publish a special appeal in their behalf in the Kirchenblatt and in addition to institute an annual personal solicitation of the members through the pastors in the congregations, again with a special appeal for liberality in the current year in view of the extraordinary expenses incurred. Annual mission festivals with special offerings for home and foreign missions also were recommended and the conferences enjoined to push them, thus finding a source of income which was soon partly to be diverted to the educational institutions. To support the instructor at the college each pastor was asked to assume an annual obligation for a contribution and the presidents of the conferences were asked to circulate lists, receive and transmit payments. Finally a standing committee was named to divide income from synodical sources between the

---

Receipts include $915.19 borrowed, but expenditures shows two items, loans $826.11 and repayments $718.37 which come near to meeting the current loan plus the deficit mentioned by Deindoerfer. Neither interest nor debts are listed, and it may therefore be, that the seminary was nearly debt free, but see footnote 23. At any rate it had during the past year been living within its income. Receipts showed $113.43 from Germany and $1,301.99 from the congregations. However a special offering brought in $739.70 more. Student income was only $260.88 plus $109. paid for students.

college and the seminary. No ratio was fixed, however, the committee was to meet from time to time to consider the needs of the two institutions.[17]

A committee was also named to deal with the Illinois Synod and provisions were adopted for its guidance. If the Illinois Synod desired to use and to contribute to the support of the synodical schools, it was to receive representation on the board of regents and to be entitled to furnish one instructor. If one of the institutions should be located in the territory of the Illinois Synod, both synods were to participate in making arrangements and regulations.[18] Establishment of a separate college served to dim prospects for a teachers' seminary. However, Deindoerfer offered on his own and Pastor Brueckner's account that they would be willing to give private training to four young men and supply practice in the Toledo parochial schools. The committee reported favorably on this offer and suggested that seminarians at Wartburg, who did not appear suited for the ministry be transferred to Toledo. The synodical treasury was to defray travel expenses if necessary and Deindoerfer hoped to meet other expenses locally. The synod accepted this proposal also and resolved to commend it to the congregations.[19]

---

[17] *K. B.* XI, 21, 168; *Zusammenstellung der Bechluesse der im Jahr 1868 zu Madison versammelten Synode von Iowa*, in I. S. D. The synod also approved the previous construction at Wartburg and laid down a mode of procedure for such eventualities in the future and provided that funds for the newly authorized construction--which was never laid down--were to be taken from the special appeal funds. The election of the Galena instructor was left to the electoral commission, election of a board of trustees was authorized and Klindworth was added to the examination commission, all of which served to make relevant provisions of the synodical constitution applicable. The loan of mission funds toward the purchase of the Galena property was to run for two years. The funds invested in the orphanage at Andrew, however, could not be liquidated and this arrangement fell through, *K. B.* XII, 23, 178. Teaching salaries at Wartburg according to *Zusammenstellung 1867* had been raised to $500 and according to the cited financial report in 1868 had been paid. Since the seminary endowment fund may have yielded $300-$500 annually toward salaries and the *Gesellschaft* paid the seminary a fixed annual contribution of $600 these two items may have approximately covered the Wartburg salaries without expense to the synod. It is possible that the contribution by pastors was intended to make a compensating arrangement for Galena and hopes may have existed that the Illinois Synod would provide for a second instructor when needed. Special appeal funds were to go 90 per cent to the schools, 10 per cent to the synodical treasury.

[18] *Zusammenstellung 1868*.

The convention of 1868 thus authorized an expansion of facilities for higher education which had been looming on the horizon for some time. It did not really establish a college, that had been done in 1864 on basis of beginnings which dated back at least ten years. The school had already taken shape within the seminary and it had for some years been open to non-theological students, a provision which was maintained and for which a greater development may have been anticipated. This school as before, however, found its raison d'etre in the preparation of younger students, most of whom it was expected to send to the seminary for theological training. No changes in curriculum, fees or regulations are indicated.[20] The institution was merely given a separate location and a staff of its own. The arrangements were quickly completed. The building was acquired and furnished after a fashion. Klindworth was named rector and was to assist in religious instruction. The instructor, Lutz, also served as house father. On October 30 the younger students left Wartburg and on November 1, 1868, the formal opening took place with twenty students in the two lower classes of the prescribed course.[21]

---

[19] Ibid. and K. B. XI, 22, 174. It may be noted that Grossmann expressed misgivings about men not suited for the ministry not being suited for teaching either. He thought they might serve if the lack of suitability consisted solely of difficulty with public speaking. The task of recommending the financial appeal to the congregations was entrusted to Pastor Bredow. He presented the cause. K. B. XI, 19, 145-6.

It was not long, however, before it became clear that financially at least the new venture was premature, with the result that for a number of years to come, both seminary and college had to struggle with great difficulties. During the ensuing year, the enrollment at the seminary dropped sharply, despite the fact that proseminary instruction with older preparatory students was still carried on at Wartburg.[22] Disciplinary difficulties also seem to have continued. In view of the financial stringency it was fortunate that new construction was not immediately needed, more extensive repairs than had been contemplated proved necessary; but could not be made. At the end of the year a deficit of $1,766.56 was reported.[23]

---

[20] The resolutions are silent on this point. However, from the beginning a six-year rather than a five-year course was contemplated, K. B. XII, 16, 123.

[21] Chronik, 90 and 93. K. M., N. F., I, 4, 26, gives the number of students as twenty-one, of whom sixteen were preparing for the ministry, ten of whom had been transferred from Wartburg (K. B. XII 9, 69) and five local youths, seeking a general education. The building acquired was a former nunnery, without a campus and only a narrow yard, enclosed within walls. It was described as a well-built brick structure 62 x 27 feet, two stories with attic and cellar and a separate wash-house. The structure is still standing. The dedication is reported K. B. XI, 22, 175-6.

The college too was having its troubles. Its student body consisted of ten transfers from Wartburg, five local youths and several new entrants during the first year. They were young boys of perhaps fourteen or fifteen, entered in the two lower classes of a six-year course. The Galena youths did not fit in well, because they could not speak German and the other boys could not profit greatly from instruction in English. There were disciplinary difficulties with both groups and before the end of the year the local group had withdrawn or been dismissed. Apparently there was also trouble over entrance at irregular periods. At the end of the year there were seventeen students, fourteen of whom had the ministry in view.[24] The need for a second teacher had already become apparent and Cand. A. Preller, newly arrived from Neuendettelsau, had been provisionally employed and was definitely employed for the next year.[25] The purchase of the property and of equipment for it had necessarily caused heavy expenditures. The bulk of the funds raised by the special appeal had been assigned to Galena, but there was much complaint in regard to unsatisfactory response to the appeal and borrowing had been necessary. The accounting showed a balance of $75.59, but the amount of the debt was not given. An ominous feature was the fact that while the accounting showed fairly considerable amounts as received for students, it showed no income from students, but carried considerable items as lent to students.[26]

---

[22] *K*. *B*. XII, 22, 171-2. Data are from a report to the convention of 1869 at Galena by S. Fritschel. Neither total numbers nor those of admissions during the year are given. Ten, however, were transferred to Galena and five more were graduated or left for other reasons. In addition several were dismissed, the comment merely stating not only for incapacity. It may be remembered that the letter with Deindoerfer's comment on discipline at Wartburg, cited in footnote 9, was written in 1869.

[23] *Ibid*. The stated amount is given, the figures actually total $1,796.56. Income had dropped sharply. Even support from regular offerings was down somewhat from the preceding year, which may have been due to the special appeal, while the amount from the appeal allotted to the seminary was much less than that of a special offering during the preceding year. There was no support credited to German sources at all and this was explained as being due to a request for payment from a German mortgage holder, in consequence all German funds had been applied there, which may refer to a remainder of the Kleinlein loan. It is difficult to see through this accounting and there is a remark that an 1868 debt of $1,120 was paid although the figures do not show it and the 1868 report made no mention of such a debt. Credit is claimed against the deficit for advances to *Synodalkasse*, etc., but again there is no exact accounting. It may be that the synod too had difficulty in getting a clear picture, for several resolutions with regulations for bookkeeping and auditing were passed, *Ibid*., 24, 189, 190.

---

[24] K. B. XII, 9, 69; 23, 177-8. The latter source is Klindworth's report to the convention of 1869. He notes an attempt to conduct some classes in English. In this report the chief blame in regard to discipline is laid on unmanagability and disinclination to study of the local element. Later in Traurige Zustande, 56, Klindworth complained bitterly about the Wartburg transfers. In 1869 he was doubtful whether it would be wise to admit local youths in the future and pointed out in general that the type of school which the college was could not expect much local support. In K. B. XII, 16, 123-4, Lutz announced the second year and in appealing for students emphasized very strongly the necessity of regular entrance at the beginning of the year. He also emphasized the necessity of talent and preparation, but particularly of Christian character. Some of the difficulties met may be inferred from these emphases, although in the source first cited above Lutz reported that on the whole the students were willing and tractable. Such difficulties were only the opening round of a half-century-long struggle by the college to mold American youth into the forms of a European educational system.

[25] K. B. XII, 23, 178-9. He served without pay in the first year. Preller's heart must have been in the work, he was willing to return for a small salary according to a letter, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, October 23, 1871, in I. S. D.,

---

yet he made the largest single contribution toward retirement of the Galena debt ($100), K. B. XV, 11, 88. He does not seem to have had private means, see a letter, Preller - Klindworth, Maxfield, February 3, 1871, in I. S. D.

[26] Chronik, 93, gives the total raised through the appeal as $2,491. The cited seminary financial report (cf. footnote 23) noted assignment to the seminary of $217.39. The college financial report K. B. XII, 23, 180, does not give the appeal figures, but has several items totalling some $2,200 which probably came under that heading. In return the regular income does not seem to have been divided between the two that year. Chronik indicates that more than $1,400 was borrowed and the college report lists $1,000 as loan repayment. Apparently, however, only $1,000 had been paid on the property. Among receipts was listed $556.74 "for theological students" and $126.70 "for other students." It is possible that this may have meant payments by parents. The other items are "lent to students" $288.68 and "advanced to others" $167.67. There is also an item "books for students" $133.38, but in the notice of the new school year it was explained that students bought or rented books, writing materials, tables, chairs from the college. It may be added that pastoral payments toward salary totalled $206 and that $348 had been raised in Galena according to Chronik; K. M., N. F., I, 4, 26-7, brings a request from Klindworth to Bauer to assist the college by asking gifts of books for its library and 8, 61, acknowledges receipts.

The convention of 1869, meeting in Galena just before the second school year was to open there, heard that relations with the Illinois Synod no longer looked promising, but apparently took no action on the provisional character of the location in Galena. To relieve the financial stringency, it provided for the appointment of a collector who was to travel on behalf of the annual appeal drive ordered the year before and Pastor Hoerlein accepted this position.[27] Some additional consideration was given to the teacher training problem. The Toledo experiment had been tried, but there too financial obstacles were looming.[28] The synod saw no way of meeting this problem and resolved to ask German friends to procure teachers as needed.[29] The seminary was also instructed to give pedagogic training to theological students in their last year.[30]

The next few years saw a return of the financial difficulties of the first decade of synod. Receipts could not keep up with expenditures of the institutions and deficits added to deficits meant mounting debts. For somewhat more than half a year collector Hoerlein strove manfully to cope with the situation. A series of articles in the Kirchenblatt presented broad needs, explained the financial system and made eloquent appeals.[31] Hoerlein travelled extensively, went into the homes of members and raised considerable sums.[32] But his expenses were high in proportion to the receipts and it became clear that it would be difficult to raise enough to support both the collector and the cause. In 1870 he took over a congregation to await a more favorable season, but the favorable season did not seem to come and the provisional charge became permanent.[33] Klindworth threw himself into the breach, visited various congregations, reported success and urged fellow pastors to follow his example.[34] But if he found emulators, they were few and their success is not recorded.

---

[27] K. B. XII, 23, 179. He was called for two years. Klindworth had urged this measure and had stated that an average contribution of $50 per year would suffice, if all congregations participated, p. 178.

[28] K. B. XII, 4, 32. Deindoerfer reported two students and prospects for more from Germany. Private charity was providing for part of the expenses of the students, but more assistance was needed.

[29] K. B. VII, 24, 189.

[30] Chronik, 92.

---

[31] These articles are in K. B. XII, 24, 192; XIII, 4, 29-30; 5, 39-40; 7, 49-52; 10, 79-80. They were readable and stressed all phases of church work, such as orphanages and even plight of an individual parish, and appealed for regular support as well as special giving.

[32] Travels in southern Illinois and Missouri are described in another series of articles, K. B. XIII, 11, 82-4; 13, 101-2; 14, 107-8; 16, 127-8; 17, 132-3; 18, 142-4; 20, 158-60; XIV, 1, 2-4. Highly readable, they deal with travel experiences, local history, etc.

[33] K. B. XIV, 20, 56. This is Hoerlein's final report to the convention of 1871. Chronik, 96, gives the total raised by Hoerlein as $1,339.28 cash plus $212.45 in subscriptions for a total of $1,551.73. His expenses are given as $462.25, including salary, leaving a net $1,089.48. Hoerlein estimated that he travelled 4,000 miles and had given 108 public addresses in seven months.

[34] K. B. XIII, 18, 141-2. Klindworth's report is entitled, Wie es gehen kann. In four parishes he raised $385. He urged

With grave difficulties confronting both institutions and intensifying rather than abating, it was natural that a certain degree of tension should develop between them, an undercurrent to be sensed in competitive efforts for support and stemming from insecurity rather than open hostility. And it is not surprising that voices began to be heard in the synod criticizing the decision of 1868 as premature and ill-advised and advocating reconsideration. The center of such suggestions seems to have lain in the Eastern Conference, represented at Madison by only two of its members, at least one of whom had been cold to the Galena plan. At any rate it was there, where the question came into the open when Pastor Kroenke wrote to Bauer at Neuendettelsau and asked advice, informing him that some of the men were discussing the possibility of abandoning one of the two institutions, because the synod was unable to support both and ruinous debts were piling up. Bauer's reply was written to synodical officials, offered advice only, but granted permission to make public use of it at the discretion of the recipients. Bauer came out strongly in favor of maintaining both institutions, regarded them as vital to synod and expressed the hope that before long a teachers' seminary could be added. He felt that the synod could support both institutions, but he considered it to be vital duty of

---

that if all pastors would do their part, within three months enough could be raised to pay the debts and carry the college through a year.

the pastors to educate the laity in regard to their fundamental necessity, thus touching directly the very core of the problem.[35] The eastern viewpoint was expressed in an answer by Deindoerfer affirming synodical loyalty of the east and disclaiming intentions of abandoning the college. However, the hope of support from the Illinois Synod had fallen through and the burden was too great, so that a return to St. Sebald, though in a separate building, was desirable. He agreed that congregations needed to be educated to support the work of the church better than they did, but also pointed out that they were generally small, poor, struggling with their own problems and that imposition of too heavy burdens through continuous special appeals would defeat its own purpose.[36]

---

[35] See a letter, Bauer - Grossmann and Deindoerfer, Neuendettelsau, December 7, 1870, in I. S. D. No copy of the Kroenke letter is extant, the indication of its contents is taken from the above letter. Bauer had been urgently invited to visit America both in 1869 and 1870 and the Gesellschaft had made means for the visit available. He had declined, but Kroenke may have hoped that he would come. Bauer states that he writes in the letter what he would say if he could be present. The letter considers it inconceivable that the seminary could be abandoned and therefore specifically advocates maintaining the college and as a separate institution. Separation was necessary because of the difference in ages and Bauer writes that he was rarely so happy as when informed of the Madison decision in 1868. He refers to the early difficulties of the seminary and to how they were overcome as incentives to the strongest efforts to solve the present difficulties. The college to him was a center of German and classical culture in America needful to breast currents of materialism. A letter, Grossmann,-Deindoerfer, St. Sebald, April 28, 1871, expresses agreement with Bauer's views and an intention of placing the letter before the coming convention of 1871.

Opinions were thus rather sharply divided when the convention of 1871 was called into session several months in advance of the set date in order to give consideration to the critical condition of institutional finances.[37] The reports of both institutions indicated that the work had been carried on, although under difficulties.[38] Financial reports showed that debts had mounted to $7,119.[39] The convention then discussed a reunion of the two institutions at Wartburg. This suggestion was rejected, because it was doubtful whether it would save a great deal and because of the old difficulties resulting from the difference in ages.[40] Abandonment of the college was then considered and also rejected, because synod needed a college.[41] When the needs of the two institutions were surveyed, it was estimated that both could be carried if $6,000 could be raised for them annually. Calculations were made to show that this should be possible. It was shown that it was not being done, because there were numerous instances where no special appeal was taken and a goodly number where not even the regular offerings were lifted. The upshot was a series of resolutions reaffirming earlier financial provisions, designating a regular education offering on Harvest Home Festival Day, allocating the offerings at mission festivals to education, improving financial administration, and providing full publicity.[42] In regard to the debt, the seminary was to cover its deficit from its endowment fund and thereafter to apply all receipts from Germany not to current expenses but to debt retirement. The college debt was to be assumed by the pastors of the synod.[43]

---

[36] Letter, Deindoerfer - Bauer, Defiance, May 11, 1871, marked copy, in I. S. D. Deindoerfer claimed to speak for the eastern clergymen, but emphasized that their attitude was constructive. He was in agreement entirely with Bauer's philosophy, but held that the method of attaining a goal must be shaped by the means available. It should be said that Deindoerfer was always emphasizing the need of deepening the spirituality of the congregations and with it their active participation in the undertakings of the church. He was therefore not making excuses, but presenting a realistic point of view. In time, he wrote, more ambitious projects would become feasible, but not if congregations were alienated by placing heavy burdens on them, now when they were neither spiritually nor, in part at least, materially ready to assume them.

[37] Chronik, 95. Due to meet in September, it met June 1-8 at Dubuque.

[38] K. B. XIV, 20, brings the seminary report, pp. 154-5, and the college report, pp. 155-6. The former deals merely with normal activities. The enrollment at the moment was sixteen, but the prospective fall enrollment would again crowd the facilities. Of ten new admissions five had come from Germany, and a considerable number of German students was in prospect. Changes in the curriculum included the catechetical course ordered by the convention of 1869. Details of devotional arrangements and practical training through student mission work were given. The college report deals primarily with the struggle for existence and indicates that indifference of the clergy was considered to be the basic difficulty. Enrollment totalled twenty-five, inclusive of three local, non-theological students while one student had been trained as teacher and placed. Detailed financial statements were mentioned, but neither report includes them.

---

[39] Chronik, 95. That of the seminary was $4,254, that of the college $2,865.

[40] K. B. XIV, 22, 193. A third teacher would be needed in any case and either a separate building would have to be erected increasing debts or the students would again have to be thrown together. Of the Wartburg group, S. Fritschel at least opposed reunion, Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 56.

[41] K. B., loc. cit. Trained men were supplied from several German sources, but students from the congregations needed preparatory training and a thorough cultural training, particularly, pastors needed such a school to prepare their sons for the ministry.

[42] Ibid. and p. 194. It was estimated that an average annual contribution of $1.50 per voting member was needed.

The convention thus went to the heart of the problem which Bauer had stressed. It resolved to preserve the educational institutions and to make an endeavor to awaken the interest of the membership and to induce it to make the necessary effort. This involved, however, a much more general response on the part of the clergy, for the facts showed clearly that many of the pastors had in the past been remiss

---

While Hoerlein was at work about half that average was achieved, but it was shown that in a group of selected congregations where the cause was urged the average ran to $2.86. But there were congregations reporting complete blanks and a selected low group averaged only $.12. Klindworth had contended that where he could reach the people they always responded and implied that the trouble lay with indifferent or hostile pastors. Since the synod was not then carrying any other major enterprise, the goal would not seem unreasonable. The financial measures did not differ essentially from those adopted in 1868 and preserved the annual special appeal. Mission festivals were to be held annually.

[43] Ibid., Chronik, 95-6. The K. B. account indicates a limited and that in Chronik a complete application of German funds to the seminary debt. Since there were eighty pastors in 1871 the average share would have been slightly more than $35, a considerable amount for the time, but apparently retirement was to take place over a period of years. The former provision for pastoral contributions to Galena salaries does not seem to have been applied after the first year and was not reaffirmed. The accounts state that a considerable sum was signed at the convention, but give no amount. According to a number of Fond Kasse leaves containing endowment fund records in Iowa Synod Financial Records, the capital of that fund at the end of 1871 amounted to $5,119.27 (the figures given actually total $5,797.27) and the seminary at that time owed it approximately $2,800, plus about $185 in accrued interest.

in carrying out synodical resolutions dealing with the support of the educational institutions. A decade earlier the burden of the seminary debt had been too heavy for the synod and that crisis could be met only by enlisting European support. Now the synod had grown to a point where the weight of the burden should not be insupportable, if only there were obtained a determined unity of purpose.[44]

During the ensuing biennium some progress seems to have been made in the struggle for more adequate support, but the means by which it was achieved are obscure. The Kirchenblatt during 1872 brought tabulations which show that most parishes made some contributions, but also that offerings were not lifted with regularity and that few congregations took the special appeal.[45] The total raised for the year amounted to $3,240.40 and thus fell quite far short of the needed total. Appeals appeared in the Kirchenblatt from which it may be inferred that opinions continued to be divided.[46] The situation remained sufficiently critical in 1872 to induce Grossmann to set up a special committee of synodical officials and others to investigate the institutional problem thoroughly and even to consider calling a special convention of the synod. The committee decided against a special convention but it looked into the situation thoroughly, inquiring into maintenance costs, student payments and debts. It published its findings and recommendations and as a result the trend seems to have changed sufficiently to enable the institutions to exist.[47]

---

[44] It may be added that Bauer's letter had been read and that the convention instructed its secretary to write a reply, and also that it was resolved again to employ a second teacher at Galena, Preller being recalled. Chronik, 95 and 101. An undated draft of a letter, List - Bauer, is in I. S. D.

[45] K. B. XV, 18, 14-15; XVI, 10, 78-79. During the first half there were total blanks for seventeen out of eighty-seven parishes; during the second half the number of complete blanks was reduced to nine, only five were blank both halves. The editor explained without giving names after the first half, that some of these congregations had poor records, but that others were new parishes. One of them is no longer listed in the second half, while two of those then carried blank were not listed for the first half. There were twenty-four blanks for the Easter offering, twenty-eight at Pentecost, forty-nine at the harvest festival and nineteen at Christmas. Only ten in the first half and three in the second reported special appeals for a combined total of $172.23. A letter, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, October 23, 1871, in I. S. D. discusses needs, and efforts to raise funds and deplores lack of a serious good will.

---

[46] Articles by Pastor Beckel, K. B. XV, 17, 133-35; 18, 141, stressed the need of the institutions for the purpose of training pastors and the duty of pastors to educate congregations in this respect. Klindworth, XV, 23, 183-4, noted a tendency to substitute mission festivals for special appeals with poorer results. (Both were ordered in 1871). Some, he wrote, were in favor of closing the institutions and others held that the costs should be borne by those who studied. But a great scarcity of pastors would result from either course. Students already bore a heavy burden, which wealthier people might well ease, if they could not send their own children. This point was elaborated somewhat in an appeal for students also by Klindworth, K. B. XVI, 8, 58-59.

[47] K. B. XVI, 17, 132, carries the presidential report to the convention of 1873 which notes the committee and refers to its activities in general terms. For the special convention see notices XV, 15, 118, and 17, 133-4. The committee published a report in a special pamphlet written by Pastor Strobel of which the writer has not been able to find a copy. The president simply referred to this pamphlet, so that it is not possible to be specific about its work. The president's report indicates that there were recommendations in regard to the debts and that rules about student payments were changed to require payments of $20 at Wartburg and $40 at Galena and also refers to measures to reduce costs at Wartburg. Klindworth,

When the synod met in convention again at Davenport in 1873, superficially some improvement could be shown. The financial statement showed small deficits at both institutions and some degree of debt reduction for both.[48] The figures cannot stand a closer inspection and it seems quite clear that neither institution had conformed to the 1871 provisions in regard to debt reduction. The seminary had applied the greater part of its receipts from German sources for interest payments and current expenses.[49] The pastors of the synod had sub-

---

Traurige Zustaende, 56, writes that the committee found that maintenance costs were much cheaper at Galena. This point needs further consideration, but at the time it seems to have been accepted and to have led to an inquiry into farm costs at the seminary with the result that it was eventually decided to rent the seminary farm. Both institutions seem to have been remiss in collecting student payments, also a point to receive further attention. Just what was done is not clear, Grossmann simply reported that income was now sufficient to meet expenses. Division of income from synodical sources between the two institutions had apparently not been equitable before 1872. Much of the money was sent to Klindworth and retained instead of being divided, which explains the rapid rise of the seminary debt after 1868. The committee seems to have provided for repayments from college to seminary which together with division arrangements became a source of tension between the two. The data are based on a statement by S. Fritschel in Bericht...Untersuchung, 44-45. Klindworth, Zeugniss does not reply to this statement; although he complained about repayments and division methods, Traurige Zustaende, 57-58.

[48] A report was published K. B. XVI, 19, 146-7. The seminary reported income since 1871 of $5,963.56 and expenditures of $6,103.66 with a deficit of $140.10. The college figures were $5,836.30 and $5,547.71, but the balance on hand was given as only $80. Loans of $499.16 listed as income here also produced an actual deficit.

[49] Chronik, 101, gives the seminary debt in 1873 as $3,461.56 and states that no new loans had been made. This may be based on the cited K. B. report which listed no new loans, but did not give a debt figure. Compared with the

scribed and paid in substantial sums for the payment of the Galena debt, but its actual reduction was considerably smaller than it should have been and some part of these funds must have been used for current expenses.[50] The convention, however, seems to have received the report without serious objections and did not reopen the question of combining the institutions.

1871 figure, which may have been given in round numbers, of $4,254 the debt had thus been reduced by $792.54. The *K. B.* account, however, credits only $581.73 to repayments against interest payments of $683.07. It also lists $640.18 as received for debt payments without specification. The figures thus do not check, although the accounting seems to cover both current expenses and debts. In 1875 List cited the seminary debt figure of 1873 from the original report as $3,461.85 which with a slight variation confirms the figures in *Chronik*, *Bericht...Untersuchung*, 55. Whatever the explanation may be, the seminary in the cited *K. B.* report, accounted for $640.18 as received for debt repayment and for $1,372.12 from abroad, which sum, totalling $2,012.30, should have gone for debt reduction according to the 1871 resolutions. It is possible that not all foreign receipts were to be applied to debts. See footnote 43.

[50] Neither *Chronik* nor the *K. B.* give the amount of the Galena debt, but *List*, *loc. cit.*, gives a statement by Lutz placing it at $1,980.13. Compared with $2,865 in 1871 this would represent a reduction of $884.87. The amount subscribed by pastors was given as $1,979. and $81 had come from congregations for a total of $2,060, but only $1,585 were reported as paid in. Even so the discrepancy is large. As in the case of the seminary the *K. B.* report confuses matters still more. Loans paid are given as $939.69 plus interest payments of $216.20 which together total $1,143.89. Receipts for debt payment, however, are given only as $1,189, which thus is only a little more than the total for loans and interest paid, but much less than the $1,585 reported to the synod as paid toward debt reduction. It may be added that Klindworth after appealing for subscriptions and payments on pledges in *K. B.* XV, 5, 39-40, receipted a total of $1,204 from some fifty pastors plus $58 from congregations, *K. B.* XV, 11, 88; XVI, 6, 48; XVII, 2, 16. In *Bericht...Untersuchung* Pastor Foelsch stated that he objected personally to Klindworth because of diversion of debt payment funds and that the latter pleaded necessity, p. 57. Finally a separate report on the college debt treasury appeared *K. B.* XVI, 24, 188, together with a general financial report for

So far as the college was concerned, it refused to authorize additional construction in Galena, requested by Lutz and approved increases in student payments for students not having the ministry in mind. A joint board of regents was created to serve both institutions, apparently in addition to the boards of trustees already existing, primarily to allot funds between both, a point which was causing difficulty.[51]

---

the synod, which lists the total of $1,585.60 as paid in and gives debts paid as $1,559.90 with a balance of $29.70 on hand, but gives no statement on the remaining debt. Since such a statement is given for all other treasuries, the omission is remarkable. It would not seem an unreasonable conclusion that some of the debts paid arose from current deficits. If this had not been done the 1871 debt should have been reduced to about $1,120.

[51] Beschluesse der Synodalversammlung 1873, in I. S. D.; K. B. XVI, 21, 145-6. Lutz had proposed an addition to the college building. The synod declined because of lack of funds, but gave the new board of regents authority to act, if funds should permit. Additional cellar construction, already undertaken, was approved. The changes in student payments seem to have been recommended by the special committee of 1872 and already placed in force. Normally students headed for the ministry should pay a total of $75, though only $20 was absolutely required and even then the board might grant exceptions, students from synodical congregations not studying for the ministry should pay $100 and those not from synodical congregations $125. Beschluesse gives the minimum as $25, and Chronik agrees, p. 110, and Beschluesse also lists the others at $125 and $150. K. B. XVI, 15, 116-7, there is an appeal for enrollment of new students, which gives the minimum at $20 and the maximum for outsiders as $115. Entrance requirements were age twelve, moral conduct, an examination and a six weeks' probation period according to this appeal. Division of income between the two institutions was becoming a difficult matter. In footnote 47 reference has been made to original inequity and the action of the committee of 1872. Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 57-8, indicates that Wartburg with higher costs objected to an equitable division, but asked for division according to costs and payment of interest on overdue payments. S. Fritschel related in 1875 that the original basis was need and not objected to by Galena, as long as higher costs there, in part because the seminary raised a part of its supplies from its farm, made this work out to its advantage. The appearance,

The college had suffered a decline in enrollment by 1873. In 1872 it had graduated its first class and sent four students to Wartburg;[52] several others had left and the enrollment was down to seventeen, in three classes.[53] Its report to the convention stressed the need for a heavier enroll-

---

however, at least, of lower costs at Galena in 1872 induced Klindworth to ask for a division according to number of students. This was refused and Galena, unable to repay moneys which it had unfairly preempted, was asked to assume interest on a corresponding portion of the seminary debt, but though agreeing failed to do so. The board of regents created in 1873 was chiefly for the purpose of making this division and also to adjust the interest question. It was given a limited power of appropriations and the right to reduce student payments in cases of need. It may be noted that according to S. Fritschel the subsequent removal of the seminary was partly actuated by a desire to create equal conditions and make division according to numbers of students possible. By then, however, the seminary had nearly twice the college enrollment and Klindworth was asking an even division of the funds. *Bericht*...*Untersuchung*, 45. Again Klindworth made no reply to this account.

[52] The graduation of the first class in 1872 after four years of operation is evidence that it had not been possible to introduce the six-year course originally planned. The second class of 1868 would complete its fifth year in 1872. One student, who, however, had not graduated was sent to Wartburg in 1873, *K. B.* XVI, 15, 116.

[53] The students were unevenly distributed, one class having ten, the others four and three respectively. Klindworth, although still rector, was not teaching during the last year, presumably because the other two men could handle the load, they were carrying twenty-four and eighteen hours against twenty-nine and thirty-two the year before when Klindworth took five. The subjects listed show few changes against 1869, Greek and Physics having been added in upper classes, *K. B.* XVI, 19, 146-7. The achievement level of the first graduates does not seem to have been high, which was due to initial difficulties, but it improved and later drew praise. Klindworth, *Traurige Zustaende*, 58-60. *Bericht*...*Untersuchung*, 49.

ment. Classes were too small and it would have to be expected that approximately half the students would not finish the course. If the college were to serve the seminary adequately, larger initial enrollments should be encouraged. The seminary report was encouraging. Thirteen graduates had been sent into the ministry during the biennium and four more were soon to follow. The enrollment had risen to twenty-six and a further increase was in prospect sufficiently heavy once again go raise the question of more room.[54] It was also necessary to engage another instructor.[55] The financial situation was less dark and steps had been taken to reduce operating costs.[56]

---

[54] The seminary report is in *K*. *B*. XVI, 19, 145-7. There was a definite request to the synod to provide for more room.

[55] The president's report *K*. *B*. XVI, 17, 132, stated this point. Coordination with the Neuendettelsau course, where there were three instructors seems to have been the basic cause, though increased enrollment was given as justification. The seminary report noted that Grossmann after an interval was again teaching music and giving the new course in catechetics. One lecture daily was now being given in English.

[56] The seminary farm was to have been rented, apparently, because the special committee of 1872 had found its operation unprofitable. However, because a rental contract had been broken, a large part of it was still being operated by the seminary during the current year. See also Klindworth, *Traurige Zustaende*, 64-5, and *Bericht*...*Untersuchung*, 54-8. It should be added that every seminary report emphasized the faithful services of Mr. Hoeger, farm manager, and Frl. von Schwartz, housemother.

If the debt was still heavy, it had been decreased somewhat and the endowment fund had grown appreciably.[57]

The convention gave thorough consideration to the problem of providing more room at Wartburg. Suggestions were made of building an addition and of erecting a separate building, but neither found much acclaim. Pastor Schieferdecker from Clarion, near Mendota, Illinois, where the synod had recently acquired a congregation, called attention to a vacant building in Mendota, which had formerly housed Carthage College. He described the building as suitable and declared that it could be purchased cheaply and also stressed the central and accessible location of Mendota.[58] The convention appointed a committee to go to Mendota to investigate and return with its report. The report stated that the building was suitable, but that rather extensive repairs were needed, since there was a defective roof and damage from seepage. The price asked was $4,000, but it could probably be had for less. There was also an endowment fund amounting to $2,100 which would probably be turned over to the synod, if it would locate the seminary at Mendota.[59] The synod resolved to purchase the property, provided that the endowment were granted, to be available toward the purchase price and that Mendota agree to raise enough funds to cover removal costs. The St. Sebald property was to be sold and applied to debts and the synod would raise the repair costs. A committee was appointed to carry on negotiations and to carry through the arrangements.[60] A newly created Ausschuss was to regulate boarding and disciplinary arrangements and to take charge of such matters as raising salaries to compensate for payments in kind at Wartburg and a committee to go to Mendota to investigate and return with its report. The report stated that the building was suitable, but that rather extensive repairs were needed, since there was a defective roof and damage from seepage. The price asked was $4,000, but it could probably be had for less. There was also an endowment fund amounting to $2,100 which would probably be turned over to the synod, if it would locate the seminary at Mendota.[59] The synod resolved to purchase the property, provided that the endowment were granted, to be available toward the purchase price and that Mendota agree to raise enough funds to cover removal costs. The St. Sebald property was to be sold and applied to debts and the synod would raise the repair costs. A committee was appointed to carry on negotiations and to carry through the arrangements.[60] A newly created Ausschuss was to regulate boarding and disciplinary arrangements and to take charge of such matters as raising salaries to compensate for payments in kind at Wartburg and engagement of an additional instructor, if finances permitted that.[61]

---

[57] A total of $2,171.25 had been added to the fund, increasing its capital to $7,366.44. Frau von Helffreich, who had died in the meantime had still contributed a substantial portion. The major accession came from Baron von Feldheim, who after residing at St. Sebald for a time had returned to Germany and left the fund his farm. Schenkungsurkunde, February 7, 1873, is in I. S. D. Only a very small portion came from American sources. The seminary itself had borrowed slightly more than $2,800, all synodical treasuries together $4,411.66. Seminar Fond Kasse leaves, Iowa Synod Financial Records give these borrowings. Other data from the seminary report are in K. B.

[58] K. B. XVI, 21, 144-5. Building an addition seemed unwise, because of the growing delapidation of the seminary. The suggestion of a new building led to questioning of the location. Scarcity of wood and water were mentioned, undoubtedly inaccessibility of location was also a factor, and perhaps recent developments in regard to the seminary farm, served to make a rural location unattractive. Schieferdecker's stress of the advantages of Mendota and its location was probably significant. The Mendota building was a brick structure 40 x 50 of four stories, ten years old and had cost $10,000-$12,000. Five acres of ground came with the property which was located at the edge of the city, but within its limits. There is no indication that it had been considered previous to the convention.

---

[59] The rain damage was described as extensive, but the structure as sound. Ibid.

[60] The conditions are in Beschluesse 1873 which in this section is almost unreadable, the provision about Mendota and moving costs may not be accurate. Chronik, 110, and the cited account in K. B. refer to conditions but do not give them. Beschluesse mentions an offer of many pastors to contribute $25 toward the purchase, if the report should prove favorable and also a resolution for a new appeal, pastors to submit subscription lists to their congregations, pledges to be paid over a year, but relates it to debt payments. The committee in charge consisted of Schieferdecker and Pastor Ade of Mendota and a member each from their congregations.

---

[59] The rain damage was described as extensive, but the structure as sound. Ibid.

[60] The conditions are in Beschluesse 1873 which in this section is almost unreadable, the provision about Mendota and moving costs may not be accurate. Chronik, 110, and the cited account in K. B. refer to conditions but do not give them. Beschluesse mentions an offer of many pastors to contribute $25 toward the purchase, if the report should prove favorable and also a resolution for a new appeal, pastors to submit subscription lists to their congregations, pledges to be paid over a year, but relates it to debt payments. The committee in charge consisted of Schieferdecker and Pastor Ade of Mendota and a member each from their congregations.

The committee for the Mendota purchase may have met competition, but it succeeded in reducing the price to $2,500 and made the purchase despite the fact that there were difficulties about collecting the endowment fund.[62] It turned out that the fund was invested and the notes were not due for several months and after some negotiations the committee accepted the notes at its own risk.[63] They found Mendota disinclined to contribute to the cause, beyond giving the Mendota fund and because hard times had begun to make themselves felt. Again the synod had chosen a panic year, as in 1857, to engage in real estate transactions and it was in consequence to have difficulties both in liquidating the Mendota fund and in selling the Wartburg property. A special appeal was therefore ordered to raise funds for purchase and repair costs, while in the meantime one of the committee members advanced $1,250 toward a down payment on the Mendota property.[64]

---

[61] Beschluesse 1873 and the account in K. B. 21. Since renting the seminary farm was also involved the intention may have been to create a new boarding arrangement at once, apparently with Mr. Hoeger taking charge. It was suggested that supervision be handled by both instructors in rotation. Since no residences were involved in Mendota, not only payments in kind, but housing would no longer be furnished.

[62] K. B. XVI, 18, 143. The lowered price attracted other buyers, at least two inspected the property, so the committee acted without insisting on the conditions. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, August 10, 1873, refers to a rumor that the Illinois Synod had offered $4,000 and regrets the conditions, since a more suitable place would be hard to find.

[63] A letter, Ade - Grossmann?, Mendota, July 14, 1873, in I. S. D. besides referring to difficulties in reaching all the owners reports that the notes representing the fund would not come due until October. They were said to be sound, but he seems to have been skeptical. The K. B. account in XVI, 18, says that there was collateral and that they were in the end taken over. Another letter, Ade - Grossmann, Mendota, October 20, 1873, in I. S. D. indicates trouble over collection. Threat of legal procedure had brought a promise to pay, but the panic had thrown the debtor into difficulties and Ade suggested taking over a house which served as collateral. Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 160, states that the matter was settled for $500 and the house which was nearby, but at a loss. The house was valued at $1,500 and the loss may have been due to the fact that a considerable amount of overdue interest was due the fund. Ade's letter of July 14 gives it a total value of $2,700. For a time S. Fritschel considered taking over the house for $1,500,

---

but did not do so and eventually the college was housed in it. See Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 62-63, and Bericht... Untersuchung, 51-53. A weak reply to the latter presentation is in Klindworth, Zeugniss, 53-4.

[64] Ade's letter of July 14 reports on Mendota disinclination and suggests an appeal. Chronik, 115, states that it was ordered and begun in the autumn of 1873. The Wartburg property was advertised in the K. B. for quite a time. Chronik, 117, indicates that the expected price was $35 per acre (roughly $6,200 for 177½ acres) but that competition from western lands long made it unsaleable. Presumably hard times also had much to do with that. Deindoerfer, Geschichte, estimates the value as $5,000, which may have been due to the fact that only sixty acres were broken and much of the rest woodland. Deindoerfer, 257, reports the sale of the major portion in the early eighties for $1,600 and of sixty acres of woodland in 1895 for $300, p. 262. The Wartburg was torn down and only a few foundation stones mark its site, K. B. XVI, 18, 143. Mr. Stammberger from Clarion, member of the Mendota committee, eventually advanced the entire purchase price of $2,500, Bericht...Untersuchung, 61. K. B. XVI, 18, 142, indicates that he originally advanced half and that the second installment was due in nine months. It may be added that a number of other suggestions were made, including locations at Mount Pleasant, Iowa, and Nauvoo, Illinois. A letter, Strobel - Grossmann, August 17, 1873, indicates that he had been asked to investigate them. At Mount Pleasant the campus of Iowa Wesleyan College seems to have been in question. A letter, Kleinlein - Grossmann, August 22, 1873, in I. S. D.

The original intention was to complete the repairs at once and to move the seminary in the fall of 1873.[65] This was not carried out but the roof was repaired in the fall and internal repairs were undertaken in the spring and done thoroughly, but with an eye toward economy.[66] In the meantime the special appeal was made to the congregations and eventually fairly good results were obtained, the *Kirchenblatt* reporting total receipts of $3,667.05 from seventy-five parishes.[67] Grossmann moved to Mendota, early in spring 1874 to supervise internal repairs. On May 18 the old Wartburg was abandoned and the personnel of the institution transferred to Mendota in a special railway carriage. In a few days classes were

---

suggested moving the college to Mendota and sale of its property to keep the seminary in Iowa. Strawberry Point made an offer toward construction at Wartburg according to a letter, Luz - --, --, Dubuque, January 1, 1874, in I. S. D.

[65] *K*. *B*. XVI, 18, 142.

[66] A letter, Ade - Grossmann, Mendota, October 20, 1873, reports that the roof had been repaired and seems to favor an early removal. Ade objected to a plan to bring a plasterer from St. Sebald to do the interior work, for it would not effect real savings. This was done, however, and considerable savings were claimed, *Bericht*...*Untersuchung*, 61-2.

[67] *K*. *B*. XVIII, 10, 80. Galena is not listed as contributing and neither is Mendota, but Clarion was high by far. The appeal at first does not seem to have gone well, it was specially commended *K*. *B*. XVII, 7, 49. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, November 8, 1873, in I. S. D. requests more effective publicity.

again under way. Mr. Hoeger, long the faithful steward at Wartburg, was taken along and placed in charge of boarding, but Auguste von Schwartz, housemother since 1861, no longer felt equal to coping with the increasing duties of her position and resigned. The formal dedication took place on June 22 with an impressive ceremony before a large gathering.[68]

The expenses involved in repairing the Mendota property and moving the seminary were covered by the income resulting from the special appeal of 1873. The debt reduction program too was continued with good results.[69] There was reason to fear, however, that the running expenses of the seminary might increase in its urban location. This fear moved Klindworth to object particularly to the proposed boarding plan and to other arrangements contemplated.[70] When his protest did not avail, he asked that a special convention of the synod be called, before the removal took place. This suggestion found a good deal of support, but Grossmann refused on the ground that under the new constitution of 1873 the president had no power to call special sessions.[71] In these moves an underlying tension was manifesting itself, which was to lead to a crisis during the following year. The regulations in question were submitted to the convention of the Western District of the synod, which met in Mendota in 1874. It made provisional arrangements increasing the salaries to $800, approving supervision arrangements without residence of an instructor

---

[68] Chronik, 117; K. B. XVII, 7, 54; 11, 86. Here the removal is described, equipment had been sent ahead; 13, 97-8, describes the dedication. After a morning service in the local church which Grossmann conducted, the dedication ceremony took place during the afternoon in the open. Ade presented the keys, Grossmann responded, S. Fritschel conducted the formal dedication and both Fritschels spoke in the park. The von Schwartz resignation received no contemporary notice. She made a visit to Russia and then returned to live in Mendota. K. B. XX, 18, 137, brings an obituary from which these data can be verified.

[69] K. B. XVIII, 20, 159, brings the financial reports submitted to the convention of 1875. The treasury for seminary removal gave an apparently complete accounting and showed a balance of $45.30. Debt figures are not given, but Bericht... Untersuchung, 78, indicates that by the time of the convention the seminary debt had been reduced to $1,786.05 and by the end of 1875 to $1,576. P. 79, the treasurer confirmed this figure, but added a deficit of $445 at convention time to give a total of $2,231.05. The cost of the property does not, however, seem included. Apparently the $500 cash from the Mendota fund settlement and another $500 had been applied for this purpose, so that an additional debt of $1,500 existed which was charged to the Mendota committee rather than to the seminary, p. 61.

---

[70] A letter, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, January 19, 1873, in I. S. D. objects particularly to the employment of Hoeger to board the students. With board charges of $2 per week and a small student body the income would not suffice to maintain Hoeger, family, students, and pay a salary, not to mention laundry and heat. He also objected to small rooms to house a few students with a degree of privacy, because fuel costs would run too high and suggested larger dormitories and study halls also to be used as classrooms. He did not like the arrangement under which teachers would rotate in charge of supervision and felt that one should live in the institution. In an earlier letter, Galena, August 8, 1873, he had objected strongly to repayment provisions and an interest charge approved by the Davenport convention. See footnote 51. He objected to unclear accounting and the method of handling the charges and declared that such procedures would ruin the college and the synod. Therefore Galena would refuse to recognize the item or any other charge made through S. Fritschel on behalf of the seminary. If Grossmann would insist on execution of the synodical directive, the Galena people would resign from financial administration. The letter was signed by Lutz as well as Klindworth. This letter marks the first open emergence of the strong animus against S. Fritschel, which Klindworth was to manifest in 1875.

[71] The decisions in regard to this special session seem to be in Ausschuss or committee minutes which are not extant. Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende gives the theological professors the blame for refusal, stating that the Galena faculty asked for it, because financial relationships needed exact regulation prior to the removal of the seminary, in view of arbitrary decisionson such matters as those discussed in the first letter cited in the preceding footnote. He maintained that several conferences and individual pastors also asked for the special

---

convention or objected to its refusal and that even the president (Grossmann) saw the necessity. A letter, Bredow - Grossmann, Maxfield, July 27, 1874, in I. S. D. indicates that he had supported the special convention. He could not understand why Grossmann could not call one and implied that the *Ausschuss* had too much power. Klindworth's pamphlet does not mention reasons for refusal but a letter, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, August 31, 1874, in I.S. D. deplores failure of the constitution to provide for special sessions and expresses constant worry over the bad state of affairs and fears of approaching destruction of the synod. The letter began with a refusal to attend a session of the *Ausschuss*, called by Grossmann for the time of the district meeting at Mendota and gave as reasons constitutional grounds, the *Ausschuss* being incompetent to act with a district convention and in place of a general convention and protested the procedure. He noted that Grossmann had in the east suggested the sending of a delegation from there to transform the district synod into a general convention, but that too would be irregular procedure. The letter shows clearly that Klindworth had his heart set on the special convention and resented its refusal. *Bericht*...*Untersuchung*, 75-77, indicates that the professors were not opposed to a special convention, but that a meeting called to consider the question agreed that it was not necessary and that Klindworth participated and somewhat unwillingly acquiesced in the decision. Grossmann took responsibility for refusal, but mentioned no constitutional reasons, his reason was unwillingness to yield to persistent agitation, when no real necessity existed. The regulations in question were referred to the *Ausschuss* at Davenport and it seems to have held a meeting in the winter to make them. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, February 14, 1874, reports that he could not attend a meeting at Galena, urges economy and retrenchment to avoid more debt, and expresses concurrence in decisions within such limits. This can not have been the session which discussed a special convention, unless Deindoerfer changed his mind, for he attended that gathering.

in the building as well as the proposed boarding plan, and directed that neither stoves nor fuel be furnished for individual student rooms.[72] It also resolved that a special convention of the synod be called the next year and provided for a visitation of both institutions, which was to examine them thoroughly and to report to the convention.[73]

Under these arrangements the seminary functioned during the next year. Financial worries were not unjustified, for a fairly considerable deficit resulted, although an enrollment of thirty-two taxed capacity. Difficulties also developed between the seminary and the local congregation which had an Evangelical background, so that eventually a separate seminary congregation with its own services was organized. There was a good deal of unrest, particularly in regard to doctrinal controversy within the synod and the unrest was increased by unabated tension between the college and the seminary.[74] That the seminary functioned normally despite all undercurrents became clear when the special visitation ordered in 1874 was conducted just prior to the convention of 1875. The visitors declared themselves fully satisfied with methods of instruction and the results achieved after visiting most of the classes, checking written work and interviewing students and faculty. They found the faculty so overloaded that they recommended engagement of a third teacher without reservation.

---

[72] Synodalbericht 1875, 28. These provisional arrangements were made permanent there and were designated as adopted by the western district in 1874. The K. B. brought no report on the district synod, minutes are not extant and Chronik, 118, while reporting the session gives no details. Klindworth's criticisms may be reflected in the heating arrangement, the administration was to arrange for heating larger rooms. The salary of Mr. Hoeger was fixed at $300 and he was to be under faculty supervision. Every student was to pay at least $20, unless exempted by the board of regents and German friends were to be notified of this provision. Enrollment if possible was to be limited to thirty.

[73] Bericht...Untersuchung, 4.

---

[74] Ibid., 79, for the deficit, 69 for the enrollment, that of the college is given as eighteen. The unrest in the synod and the upheaval that resulted in 1875 will receive separate treatment in a later chapter. The financial situation at the college was serious and combination at Mendota was again under consideration, Grossmann had come to favor this course, Ibid., 53, although the Mendota faculty was still opposed. Klindworth was charged by the convention of 1875 with ceaseless agitation to build up a party of his own and to obtain control within synod, a charge which he denied. Traurige Zustaende, 23-28. Both Bredow and Foelsch testified repeatedly, however, at the ensuing investigation, that he had drawn them into his faction by sowing suspicion. A letter, Luz - --, Dubuque, June 1, 1874, in I. S. D., perhaps to Deindoerfer, seems to indicate that deliberate misinformation mingled with defense of legitimate points of view was given to Luz when he had visited Galena recently. Luz wrote that he had been mistrustful, but was so no longer, neither envy nor factionalism reigned there, but the Galena men were concerned with necessary economies, and demanded sound bookkeeping and were justified in asking for a special convention. He had, however, also been told that rents were paid at Mendota to the extent of $375 annually, that the faculty still received payments in kind, etc. Klindworth was in a position to know better, e. g., on the payments in kind see Bericht... Untersuchung, 73. There were also rather malicious references to Mendota boarding conditions and the church situation. After Luz had received a reply, his next letter, Dubuque, June 12, 1874, indicated a readiness to hear both sides and suspend judgment, as well as friendly feelings toward Mendota, and he stated that he had defended the faithfulness of the Mendota men at Galena and admonished toward a respectful attitude. On the Mendota church situation see Klindworth, Zeugniss, 32, 33 and K. B. XVIII, 15, 118.

They were also fully satisfied with morale and discipline. They also checked finances and while not commenting on a deficit, found that maintenance costs averaged $48 per capita. There were only minor complaints in regard to board, which were adjusted.[75]

While the visitors were at Mendota, they received a letter from Klindworth informing them that the college would not be opened to them. They went to Galena despite this, but failed to reach an understanding and had to leave without conducting their visitation. The reasons for the refusal were chiefly constitutional, though Klindworth also had objections to the personnel of the visitation committee. The refusal drew criticism at the convention and Klindworth gave a qualified apology but the visitors could not give a report on the college and in consequence it is not possible to draw a picture of college conditions in 1875 comparable to that presented for the seminary.[76]

---

[75] Synodalbericht, 1875, 25-27. Teaching methods combined lectures and discussion, results in the main were satisfactory, exceeding expectations of the visitors in some respects. Morale and spirit were such as to justify hopes for good pastors. Food was plentiful, complaints concerned preparation and were taken up with those in charge. There was complaint about laundry arrangements and the committee recommended reducing the minimum pay to $10 and letting students make their own laundry arrangements. Certain repairs were also recommended.

[76] Ibid., 26. Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 10-15, presents his case. He had not known of the Mendota resolution in regard to the extraordinary visitation. It was ordered at the last moment before the convention, at a time when an Ausschuss session should have been held, and left no time for clearing up the misunderstanding, which to him made the visitation appear irregular and inspired by ulterior purposes. He

The special convention of 1875, although called to deal with institutional problems, devoted the greater part of its sessions to acrimonious doctrinal controversy and to attacks upon the positions of the theological faculty, which in some instances called their integrity into question. No complete harmony could be achieved and as the end approached several protests were signed and presented and there were a number of withdrawals and more impending. Klindworth took an active part in these proceedings and his name and those of Lutz and Preller were signed to protests, though none of the Galena faculty withdrew at the convention. To the majority, however, Klindworth seems to have become suspect as the head of a faction intent upon a radical reorientation of the historic position of the synod. These issues will need a closer scrutiny in a later chapter, here they are noted, because they diverted attention from institutional problems, with the result that these had to be disposed of quickly at the very end of the convention and that the disposition was inevitably affected by the suspicions that had arisen.

---

did not specify his objections to the personnel, except for a hint that he may have regarded the members (Deindoerfer, Luz, Foelsch) as educationally unqualified. Bericht...Untersuchung, 4, gives reasonable replies, but ignores the point concerning a constitutionally ordered session of the Ausschuss on the days assigned for the visitation. Since Klindworth's record shows that he consistently stood for constitutional regularity it appears reasonable to assume that his motive was not the prevention of the visitation, and that the charge of insubordination brought against him by the Synodalbericht did not adequately take his motives into account.

Klindworth had placed a lay delegate from Galena on the committee which dealt with finances. This delegate raised a number of questions in regard to the seminary accounts, but none of them led to proof of serious irregularities and the financial position of the seminary was in fact relatively sound.[77] The college books showed an approximate balance and the debt a considerable increase.[78] Since the books showed no loans to account for the increase in the debt, the chairman asked the delegate whether there were unpaid accounts, not shown on the books. He could not give the information. Later a question was put to Lutz, the treasurer, and he too could not give an immediate explanation in regard to debt increases, so that the point was deferred. When it was taken up again, Lutz was not present. Inquiries revealed that he had left Madison and further that he had taken the college books from the committee room and taken them with him.[79] It was reported that Klindworth too had left Madison.[80] The convention was then in its last hour. It found it impossible to get a clear picture of Galena finances. Certain utterances were reported to it, which aroused suspicions, that it was Klindworth's intention to leave the synod and to take along the college, which was not incorporated and therefore legally in the hands of its trustees.[81] The synod thereupon resolved to close the college at Galena and to combine it with the seminary at Mendota. A special committee was constituted to carry out these purposes and supplied with the necessary instructions.[82] The provisional arrangements of 1874 for

---

[77] Bericht...Untersuchung, 15, states that Klindworth had the delegate, A. Habich, assigned to the finance committee. Klindworth's writings do not dispute this point. Traurige Zustaende, 66-70, brings a report by Habich written at Klindworth's request. He questioned a number of entries and the manner of keeping the books, as well as the administration of the endowment fund and by contrast found the college books in good order. Klindworth followed this with comments, 70-76, finding that nearly $2,000 were not adequately accounted for and that the chief difficulty was that S. Fritschel had foisted off onto synod the house received with the Mendota endowment, for which he was personally liable. Bericht... Untersuchung, 60-75, deals with these points in detail and gives satisfactory explanations of the questioned items. Klindworth had questioned also the visitation committee report that maintenance of students at Wartburg averaged $48, confusing maintenance costs and total costs per student. A comparison, p. 69, here also resulted favorably to the seminary. Klindworth's reply, Zeugniss, 48-59, attacks this but is not convincing. A defense of Habich also does not meet the points raised by the Bericht. Contentions in regard to repayment accounts are confusing in both accounts. So far as seminary finances in 1875 are concerned, the weakest point was that a deficit of about $450 had resulted from operating costs during the first year. Inclusive of this the debt ran to about $2,200, (see footnote 69). Against this, stood the farm then valued at $5,000 or more though finally sold for $1,900 and the endowment fund then worth $7,604.44 according to K. B. XVIII, 20, 159, while against the Mendota property stood another debt of $1,500 resulting from its purchase.

---

[78] The K. B. report just cited does not separate the institutions. Bericht...Untersuchung, 78, brings a statement which in regard to the seminary does not agree with other figures. For the college it listed receipts $4,725.76 and expenditures $4,653.17. P. 79 gives the debt as about $3,500. The figures cover a two-year period and the second year showed a deficit. P. 15 indicates that it amounted to $400.

[79] Synodalbericht 1875, 28. Bericht...Untersuchung, 65, indicates that the question arose in the committee and that Habich promised to get the information but did not and subsequently left the convention. Lutz was asked to explain, before the convention and also promised to get the information. It was necessary for a fair comparison of student maintenance funds at the two institutions.

[80] A messenger sent to call Lutz reported that he had left. It was reported that Klindworth had also left, but this was not checked and he was still in Madison, excused from attendance for illness, Klindworth, Zeugniss, 25.

---

[81] Synodalbericht 1875, 29; Chronik, 123. Klindworth and Lutz were suspended from synodical membership. Klindworth resented the suspension and rejected the suspicion, Traurige Zustaende, 30-32; Zeugniss, 28-36. Corresponding counter-presentation is in Bericht...Untersuchung, 17-20. Klindworth had in 1874 admittedly written a letter, in which he envisaged the possibility of two conferences leaving the synod, and constituting themselves separately. The property belonged to the trustees who all lived in Galena. It could be taken along and converted into a seminary. Some word of this letter seems to have spread in the convention. In a suspicious state of mind already, leading members seem to have come to fear that Klindworth would try to take the college out of the synod. G. Fritschel also informed German circles to this effect. Even when he made no moves in this direction, the idea prevailed that he merely feared legal complications. It seems quite clear that the suspicion was real even at the subsequent investigation half a year later. S. Fritschel was still firmly convinced that such had been Klindworth's intentions. It seems equally clear that the suspicion was unjustified, at least Klindworth never made the slightest attempt to take over the college.

[82] Synodalbericht 1875, 29. The committee (Luz, Foelsch, Wittig) was to organize and plan procedure at once and was authorized to sell the Galena property for an acceptable price. Together with the seminary administration it was provisionally to arrange for locating the college at Mendota and was so to arrange matters that expenses could be kept within the limits of current income. It was to report to the next convention.

Mendota were ratified and the board of regents was authorized to deal with the recommendations of the visitation committee.[83]

Thus a convention at Madison in 1875 ended the undertaking at Galena which an earlier convention at Madison had authorized in 1868. While the controversies of 1875 had prepared a mental climate which made it readily possible to reach this decision unanimously, the real cause lay in financial difficulties which had convinced the synod that the step taken in 1868 had been premature. There was no thought of abandoning the college and its relocation was provisional, even as its original location had been provisional. The synod might in the future again consider a separate location for its college, or if it was to be left in Mendota, more adequate quarters than those which now could house perhaps twenty students would have to be provided. But for the present that would have to do, and the enrollment had rarely been larger than that in any case. Debts would have to be paid and the synod would have to grow to provide a larger income before more ambitious plans could be considered. Hard times had forced a decision, which even in good times had seemed the best solution to many.

Winding up affairs at Galena took some time. Two of the committee members went to Galena almost immediately and in the absence of the instructors, who had not returned, informed the students of the synod's decision. Klindworth had been summoned and objected to direct dealings with students, especially since the committee members had neglected to bring credentials and turned them out, threatening to call on the authorities.[84] The committee members secured credentials and returned to meet with no further trouble of this kind. Klindworth had left for Germany, but he had left a power of attorney behind authorizing transfer of the property, and Lutz was cooperative. The affairs were found to be in a rather bad state. Debts exceeded $3,500.[85] It was learned that, as had been suspected at Madison, the accounts failed to include unpaid bills. Apparently Galena bookkeeping had followed this practice for some time. When the books were closed, a good balance could thus be shown. After the closing of the books the unpaid bills were added to the debt. It was at least partly this practice that explains discrepancies in the past between receipts for debt and actual reduction and the steady rise in the Galena debt, despite great efforts at reduction. Galena thus was also enabled to make a showing of lower per capita maintenance expense than at Wartburg, for this item seems to have been calculated without taking debts into account.[86]

---

[83] *Ibid*., 28. The board of regents was to make essential repairs as soon as possible and the administration was to settle laundry complaints.

---

[84] This account follows a letter, Luz - --, Dubuque, June 7, 1875, in I. S. D. The synod had adjourned June 2, the date of the visit is not given. Luz wrote that they asked for Lutz and were told that he was not expected back until the following week. A messenger was sent for Klindworth and then the students were called together, because the visitors feared that Klindworth would refuse permission to see them. When the latter arrived he asked the visitors to leave the room and spoke to the students himself. When he returned to the visitors, they informed him of the synod's actions. After the request for credentials, the order to leave and the threat, Klindworth reprimanded the visitors for talking to students before seeing the teachers. After a reply that they had asked for Lutz and a criticism of his absence during a school term, Klindworth became vituperative against the convention and its actions. Klindworth, Zeugniss, 29-30, ignores the inquiry for Lutz and his own summons and declares that he asked for credentials, and protested that business matters should be taken up with the trustees and school matters with the faculty. When he received the reply that the faculty had been deposed, he asserted that he was still in charge and threatened to call the authorities. He also wrote that the visitors had told the students to leave for Mendota immediately. Luz in the cited letter did not express fears in regard to Klindworth's purposes but in another, Luz - --, Dubuque, June 21, 1875, in I. S. D. he thought Klindworth might try to retain the building and suggested that it might be well to take over the inventory at once, lest creditors attach it.

---

[85] A letter, Luz - --, Dubuque, June 24, 1875, in I. S. D., reports on the second visit and gives the debt as $3,522.66. It may have been higher for unpaid bills may not all have been reported at that time. In 1879 the remaining debt was reported as $2,070.36, although by that time the building had been sold for $1,700 and $400 to be noted subsequently had been applied. No final accounting seems to be extant, but it seems that debts and unpaid bills totalled well over $4,000.

[86] Bericht...Untersuchung, 47-48. Klindworth did not reply to this presentation. Klindworth's pamphlets are highly critical of the bookkeeping at the seminary and charge the seminary with wasteful and selfish practices. The investigation in return held Galena to be guilty of deceptive practices. It seems quite clear that while neither party was deliberately dishonest, both were open to criticism. Seminary bookkeeping was in inexpert hands and it was not easy to see through the accounts and minor errors occurred. It may also be that charges against the college were handled in a questionable manner, although the original fault lay with the latter, which had taken too large a portion of synodical income for itself originally and later resented repayment regulations. College bookkeeping was clear, but as shown in the text somewhat misleading. Anxious to make a good showing in balanced accounts

The assets found by the committee consisted largely of unpaid student accounts of which there was a large amount.[87] While the college seems to have made efforts to collect student payments as required by the synod, the figures indicate that notes must have been taken for considerable amounts. Beyond this the college seems from the beginning to have advanced money to needy students for personal expenses. When students left the college, some of them seem to have owed it money not only on account of tuition and board, but also on account of such advances. It seems clear that such practices must have contributed to the debt burden. As assets these sums were questionable, and while efforts were made to collect them, there is no record of how successful they were.[88]

The Galena trustees were willing to turn the college over to the committee, but on condition that the synod assume complete financial liability. Since they were responsible for the increase in the debt and since it turned out that they had constructed an addition despite the unfavorable decision of synod on this point and had personally advanced or guaranteed the necessary funds, their position was unpleasant. In

---

and in per capita expense, the college seems to have taken advantage of inexpert auditing at synodical conventions which for some time did not inquire into debt increases. Overdue student payments may have covered the unpaid bills theoretically.

[87] The Luz letter cited in footnote 85 indicates that the students then at Galena owed $633.60 and that older accounts, probably largely worthless, totalled $1,691.75. Here also there is no final accounting to indicate whether these figures were accurate and how much was paid in.

[88] Bericht...Untersuchung, 70. Collection of student accounts was a sore point in both institutions and Galena

addition to this there was the original agreement of 1868 according to which the trustees had supposedly assumed the risk for the purchase.[89] While maintaining the position that the trustees bore a responsibility of which only the synod could relieve them, the committee was ready to acknowledge a moral responsibility toward creditors who had advanced money in good faith to a synodical cause and was ready to come to an agreement for orderly liquidation. This agreement provided for certain advances, for sale of the inventory to the seminary and for sale of the property as well as for endeavors to collect student accounts. The trustees were to cooperate in the sale of the property on favorable terms. Proceeds were to be applied to bills and debts. The trustees accepted this agreement and the Ausschuss ratified it, with the assurance that the synod desired to protect creditors in good faith against loss, but with a reservation of the

---

seems to have had a better record in collecting cash payments, despite the arrears, than the seminary. Notes were commonly taken at Wartburg and doubtless there were losses there also. However, there are usually considerable items under the headings repayments in the seminary financial reports, which probably represented payments on such notes.

[89] Ibid., 19-25. Klindworth maintained that the Madison minutes of 1868 were in error on this point. He and Habich had agreed to guarantee that synod would suffer no loss, if the provisional arrangement in Galena were terminated after two years, Zeugniss, 37. Debts arising from the purchase of the property seem to have been carried as college debts from the beginning and synodical funds seem to have been used in efforts to reduce them. The college, however, was not incorporated and the trustees seem to have held the title and to have borne legal responsibility for all obligations.

right to reject irregular debts. It also reserved the synod's rights under the 1868 resolution and asked Klindworth to declare himself on this point.[90]

Apparently this agreement was not carried out to the complete satisfaction of the synod. The property was sold in 1876 for $1,700.[91] The committee reported the sale to the convention of 1879 and noted that most of the debts outstanding in Galena were paid. A debt of $2,070.36 remained, most of which was advanced by synodical treasuries. Considerable sums in student accounts were still outstanding, but only a small part offered prospects of collection. The convention resolved to take over all credits and debits and to authorize the committee to collect accounts through legal process. It expressed regret that the so-called trustees of

---

[90] Chronik, 129. The seminary was to pay $250 for the inventory and the synod was to advance $150 against accounts due, so that store debts could be paid at once. Further collections were to pay additional unpaid bills and then notes. A mortgage might be placed on the property. Trustees and committee were to endeavor to raise additional funds for debt payment. During these proceedings creditors were pressing claims and at least one attachment took place. Legal action was threatened at several points, some of the trustees flirted with the idea of a suit against synod. A letter, Luz - --, Dubuque, November 15, 1875, expresses the wish that Klindworth and Lutz might have property, so that they could be held responsible.

[91] A letter, Luz - --, April 28, 1876, in I. S. D. offers this information. Luz wrote that this was more than expected, but it represented a loss of $300 on the original investment without considering additional construction. The letter indicates, however, that either the trustees consummated the sale against the wishes of the committee, or used the proceeds in an unacceptable way, perhaps by repaying their own advances.

Galena in violation of the risk which they had assumed in 1868 had irresponsibly involved synod in debt and embarrassment and had escaped it themselves and evaded all responsibility.[92]

The college in the meantime had been transferred to Mendota, where it was quartered in the house received in settlement of the Mendota fund. The students were received there in the fall of 1875. They thus had their own home and were not intermingled with the seminary students as before 1868. A resident housefather who taught part time was in charge of supervision. Students of both institutions shared the boarding arrangement under Mr. Hoeger. A special instructor was engaged and part of the instruction was given by the seminary staff, which was also augmented through the engagement of an instructor.[93] The duration of the college course was reduced to four years.[94]

---

[92] Chronik, 155.

[93] K. B. XVIII, 15, 117-8; Chronik, 130. List was housefather, Cand. Knappe was instructor in the college and Cand. Richter in the seminary. Instructor here for the first time denotes subordinate rank, up to this time there were only professors. No difficulty is recorded about the student transfer, but there is no indication that all of them came to Mendota.

[94] There is no contemporary notice of this, but there was a four-year course when the Mendota arrangement was ended ten years later. It may be presumed, that the change was introduced, because of limitations in the teaching staff and in accordance with the instructions to stay within available means by the convention of 1875.

Both seminary and college seem to have functioned normally under these arrangements for the remainder of the first quarter century of the synod. No particular difficulties or problems are recorded, although means remained limited.[95] Attendance was limited by the facilities, but seems to have stood at capacity, fifteen to twenty in the college and thirty to thirty-five in the seminary.[96] Pastor List soon resigned and was replaced by Professor H. Thilo who gave full time to the college and took over the supervision.[97] The college sent graduates into the seminary, but not all its students had that career in mind and in any case it could not have graduated large enough numbers from its limited enrollment to keep the seminary filled, which accordingly still drew many of its students from Germany or directly from the congregations.[98] Financial records indicate that operating costs were gradually brought into balance, but that the debt remained almost unchanged.[99]

---

[95] K. B. XIX, 17, 133-4, brings a report, which states that the students ate, but not well. Little meat could be served, substitute coffee, almost no sugar, butter only when it was donated. The writer noted that there was little complaint, but appealed for better support, in particular for supplies in kind from congregations.

[96] Ibid. The number in the college is given as some twenty and in the seminary thirty to thirty-five. This was in 1876. There were no synodical conventions until 1879 and consequently no reports. A printed report was ordered for that convention, but it did not appear, while in expectation of it the K. B. did not bring the reports. Chronik, 153, gives a brief account, but not enrollment numbers. Since it reports forty-eight seminary graduates for the four-year period, the enrollment must have been at capacity.

[97] Chronik, 153. Instructor Knappe seems also to have left at that time and not to have been replaced. List had taught two hours daily.

The financial burdens involved in carrying both a college and a seminary had for a number of years made it impossible to give serious consideration to the need for a teachers' seminary. It will be recalled that a beginning had privately been made in the Eastern Conference, but both Brueckner and Deindoerfer had soon left Toledo and the beginning had not been continued. There had been discussion of the possibility of bringing partly trained students from Germany and completing their training at Galena, and of a teachers' seminary in the Eastern Conference in cooperation with the Michigan Synod, but the objection to the former plan was that such students would not acquire the requisite mastery of English and the Michigan Synod soon drifted away from all thought of rapprochement with the Iowa Synod just as had the Illinois Synod.[100] It has been noted that an occasional teacher was prepared at Galena, but no regular teacher training course was established there, even though Bauer had suggested that possibility in his reflections on the educational system of the Iowa Synod in 1871.

---

[98] Ibid. Of forty-eight graduates, thirteen came from the college, eleven from the congregations and twenty-four from three different German sources. The large number of entrants from congregations would seem to indicate that pro-seminary training for older students must also have been continued, though no mention is made of it. Deindoerfer had a son in the college during these years, who did not enter the seminary, Rechunungs und Vermoegensachen, Deindoerfer Papers, and there may have been others. The source just cited gives a glimpse of the costs involved. Deindoerfer recorded $200 paid to the college and expenditures varying from $84.90 to $114.60 for travel, clothes, books, and personal expenses over a four-year period, including some payments to the college, which may duplicate the item first given.

[99] K. B. XXII, 21, 167, brings financial reports to the convention of 1879, for the two preceding years. In the first year receipts of $5,011.56 and expenditures of $4,923.22 left a balance of $88.34; in the second receipts were $4,667.32 inclusive of the previous balance and expenditures $4,619.37 with a balance of $47.95. The report indicates that debt repayments of a little more than $900 took place. The remaining debt, however, was $3,506.10 of which $3,256.10 was owed to the endowment fund. Over against some $3,700 debts in 1875 if both the seminary debt and the Mendota property debt are figured, which now seem to be combined, the reduction amounts to only some $200. The figures on debt payments therefore would seem to indicate that fairly substantial deficits must have occurred in two preceding years. The endowment fund figures were not given, but it was noted that the estate of Auguste von Schwartz had added $1,400 to it.

---

[100] A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Toledo, June 26, 1869, in I. S. D. deals with the problem of training teachers. He was then training two men and wished to continue the work, although he saw that it could not long be continued on a private basis. He seemed to wish to enlist the support of the Eastern Conference where the need for teachers was most pressing. Grossmann seems to have feared that this would work to the detriment of the synodical institutions. Deindoerfer mentioned but did not like the Germany-Galena plan, for the reason given and also because it would mingle students of different ages as at the seminary. He emphasized a small and modest beginning and seemed hopeful of getting the Michigan Synod to furnish a teacher, while the Iowa Synod would furnish students through its German connections. It would make more intensive work in the congregations possible and spur them to greater sacrifices and thus in the end benefit rather than injure other institutions. A letter, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, March 1, 1871, in I. S. D., refers to possibilities of training

The need for teachers, however, continued to grow. After the two institutions of the synod had been combined at Mendota plans for training teachers again began to be advocated. Grossmann, who severed connections at Mendota after a severe illness in 1875, but who was drawing a small salary as president and not serving a congregation, was willing to go back into the work with which he had begun. The administration of the orphanage at Andrew offered space and inexpensive board for a limited number of students and was willing to pay the salary of another teacher, if the projected seminary would take charge of the orphanage school, which it might well be able to use to give its students practical experience.[101]

The *Ausschuss* considered these offers and gave its consent in 1878, subject to approval by the synod at its convention in the next year. The cost was estimated at $600 annually and was to be raised through voluntary subscriptions.[102]

---

occasional teachers at the college. *K. M.*, *N. F.*, I, 18, indicates that the Eastern Conference requested in 1869 that the Toledo plan be abandoned.

[101] *K. B.* XXI, 23, 179, brought a report on the opening of the seminary and mentioned most of these arrangements. According to this report several conferences were preparing resolutions to the synod calling for such a school. *Chronik*, 141, mentions the arrangement and states that Grossmann submitted the project to the *Ausschuss*. He may have been induced to do so by requests from within the synod and conference plans. The orphanage then had two large buildings. The board charged per student per week as $1, *K. B.* XXI, 15, 114-5.

[102] *Ibid.* Deindoerfer reported the project to the convention of the Eastern District in 1878 stressing the need

The enrollment was to be limited to a class of six and in the following year another class of six might be admitted. The students were secured and some promise of support likewise. Pastor Eichler was called to join Grossmann as second teacher, his qualification being particularly a good command of English, because the students would need to teach in that language also. On October 1, 1878, the project got under way at Andrew.[103]

When the convention of 1879 met, a report presented the case of this project. There was favorable comment on the results attained during the first year. Financially some support had been received from pastors, but there was a small debt. For the future, offers had been received from Andrew, Mitchell and Waverly, all in Iowa if the school were to be located in these localities.[104] The convention resolved

---

and recommending support. From his statement it appears that the Ausschuss had given its consent, provided that support to the extent of $600 and six students were assured, K. B. XXI, 14, 106. A report on this convention states that it had asked its pastors to make contributions or raise funds in their congregations for the first year. Deindoerfer added an editorial note expressing the hope that such contributions would not interfere with regular offerings and that the Western District would also help, Ibid., 16, 126. In the presidential report he had specified that the support should not be at the expense of the seminary. The Western District held no convention in 1878.

[103] K. B. XXI, 23, 179. No public announcement of the project was made. One of the students came from Ohio, the others from Iowa. According to Chronik, 141, the orphanage paid part of Eichler's salary.

[104] Chronik, 154. An examination committee reported favorably on instruction. About half the pastors had given

to recognize the school. It was to be developed within the means available. Pastors were asked to sign pledges specifying the amount they would raise for the school during the next biennium. A committee was created to make a choice among the location offers and provided with instructions.[105] Subsequently Waverly offered to raise $4,000 toward the erection of a building and the committee accepted this offer by unanimous vote. Thereupon the seminary in September 1879 was transferred to Waverly and provisionally quartered in a rented hotel. The second class of six was joined by a number of local students who seem to have sought a general education.[106]

---

support. It had fallen short of the goal, which may explain the debt of $90.04. Income was given as $355.38, expenditures as $347.91. No details were given on the offers of Andrew and Waverly, though a later offer from Waverly will be given. Mitchell had offered a courthouse, which was to revert to the city if the synod ever discontinued its use as a school, letter, Bredow - Grossmann, Maxfield, March 16, 1879, in I. S. D. Bredow had gone to inspect and had been asked what else was desired. He asked Mitchell to rebuild the structure according to a plan to be furnished, to add a house and provide space for an elementary school of one hundred pupils. All this too had been promised in a public meeting, but Bredow had promised to open the practice school to the public on payment of tuition and to offer both elementary and classic course, as well as to open selected courses in the seminary itself and to provide instruction in music. He estimated the property alone to be worth $10,000.

[105] Chronik, 154. The second teacher was to be ranked as professor and receive a salary of $400 and $50 was appropriated for most pressing library needs. The committee was to select whichever place a two-thirds majority should choose, and decide by majority vote only if two-thirds was not attainable. Five trustees were elected who were to incorporate the school.

[106] Ibid. Building soon met difficulties since it turned out that the pledges were payable on completion of the building.

With these steps the teachers' seminary had come into full-fledged existence and the synod again had two educational institutions in different locations. In 1854 when the synod was organized it had a school for training teachers which it was already converting into a theological seminary. At the end of its first quarter century it was again providing itself with a normal school.

While the activities of the synod in higher education were beset with perplexing problems during this fifteen year period, there was a considerable measure of achievement and progress. In 1879 the synod had a seminary which was supplying it with the greater part of its man power. Trained pastors were still joining the synod from European sources, but the greater number of German youths came as students to get at least part of their training in the seminary, and a considerable number of native youths received their entire training there. While the seminary still bore a burden of debt its existence had become secure. It had not proved possible to maintain a college in a separate location, but the school had not been abandoned. Though small, too small to serve fully the needs of the seminary, it was well established and awaiting

---

Since the synod had made no building appropriation it was necessary to take new pledges. There were to be considerable financial difficulties, which however, belong into the next period.

the day, when it could be expanded to serve its purpose more adequately and completely. Nor was it designed to serve the seminary exclusively. It was available for sons of the church who sought a general education. If few availed themselves of the opportunity, the cause lay in the fact that the synod did not yet realize that a much broader educational program was required to appeal to American youth. The teachers' seminary had made a promising beginning, but it had yet to graduate its first class and only the future would tell whether the purpose to which it was dedicated, the strengthening of the system of parochial schools, was capable of realization.

CHAPTER XIII

GROWTH: REACHING OUT TOWARD THE UNCHURCHED 1864-1879

The Iowa Synod had forty-one pastors in service in 1864. This number was more than tripled by the end of the first quarter century when there were one hundred thirty-six. The number of pastors placed into service was considerably larger, because of losses through death, resignation or withdrawal. While some pastors came to the synod from other church bodies, by far the greater part of the increase was trained at the seminary or at German institutions, which were supplying men to the synod. As yet it was the smaller part of this supply of manpower that came from native sources. While the college was serving a limited enrollment and while not all of its students completed their course or entered the ministry if they did, it was serving during the seventies as a preparatory institution which accepted American youths from the age of twelve and gave them a classical training and then sent them on to the seminary. By the end of the period a second generation was beginning to make its appearance, a few sons of the older pastors being entered upon the clerical roster.[1] In addition, older men from the congregations were received at the seminary and given preparatory training designed to enable them to pursue theological studies. Even in these preparatory courses, however, a portion of the students came from Germany. Although a beginning was made, the day when synod might rely on native sources for manpower was not yet at hand.

---

[1] Gottfried Fritschel, oldest son of S. Fritschel was ordained at the Jubilee Synod of 1879, Chronik, 157, which also, p. 143, gives the total of one hundred thirty-six. G. Fritschel had after attending the seminary spent two years at the University of Pennsylvania and three years in Germany at Erlangen and Leipzig, earning his Ph. D. at the latter

Neuendettelsau continued throughout the period to train men for foreign service and most of its graduates entered the ministry in the Iowa Synod. There were times when the relationship underwent considerable strain, but such difficulties concerned doctrinal controversy and need not be discussed at this point. Adjustments were always reached and the relationship continued unbroken. Both Loehe and Bauer died during the period, but J. Deinzer carried on the work. Changes in military service obligations made in Germany after the rise of a new order in 1866 facilitated the tasks of the *Missionsanstalt*,[2] so that it was enabled to expand curriculum and enrollment and to acquire buildings to

---

university in 1878. He died after a year or two of service. Grossmann also had a son at the seminary. Schieferdecker sent a son through college and seminary, who then also went to Germany for advanced study, but never entered the ministry.

[2] German youths were free to migrate before they reached conscription age, as well as after their term of military training. The law seems to have been altered in Bavaria in conformity with a pattern universal throughout Germany. *Freimund*, 1868, 6, 47. 7, 227-8, notes that it removed crushing difficulties and *K. M.*, *N. F.*, I., 12, 89, calls the law a blessing for the *Missionsanstalt*. Youths up to twenty could emigrate freely, formerly they were restricted after sixteen.

house its students.[3] Considerable thought was given to working out a curriculum coordinated with that at Wartburg.[4] Since the graduates were rather young, proposals were made looking forward to their employment in America as vicars and assistants, before assignment to independent parishes. Agreeing to this the synod in 1869 provided that such men be employed as assistants in larger congregations or in missions, or that they be assigned to assist ill pastors. As a rule they were not to be ordained before the age of twenty or given independent positions before they were twenty-one.[5]

---

[3] *K. M.*, *N. F.*, I, 12, 89, 90. Formerly they had limited classes to four students, enrolling four more to replace graduates. This was not to be changed, but a preparatory class of four or five students was to be added, whose members were to be trained for a year and then sent to Wartburg and replaced, thus doubling the annual enrollment and providing students for the Iowa Synod as well as pastors, but not increasing the number of the latter. Until 1867 Bauer carried on instruction in his home, the students being boarded at an inn. The *Gesellschaft* acquired the house and rebuilt it into a *Missionshaus* which was dedicated in 1867, *Chronik*, 84. Students were housed and had their meals there, although the inn still provided food, *K. M.*, *N. F.*, II, 3, 20, 21. In 1870 a second building was completed, a connecting wing between the two was planned, but not constructed during this period, *K. B.* XIV, 6, 43.

[4] The integration of courses of instruction developed from the establishment of the preparatory class in Neuendettelsau. Some of its members wished to enter the theological course there and were admitted into its intermediate rather than its beginning class. This proved feasible and even advantageous, but it seems to have caused fifficulties when such students wished to transfer to Wartburg after a second year in Neuendettelsau, perhaps because they were nearing the military age. Coordinated curricula in which both institutions always offered the same courses at the same time seemed desirable. *K. M.*, *N. F.*, II, 8, 59-60. There were difficulties, particularly because Neuendettelsau had three teachers and Wartburg only two. See letters, Bauer-Grossmann and Deindoerfer, N. D., December 7, 1870, and Bauer - Grossmann, February 5, 1871. According to the *K. M.* source these were adjusted when S. Fritschel was in Europe in 1870. The seminary submitted the plan to the convention of 1871 and it was adopted, *K. B.*, XIV, 20, 154-5; 22, 194. See also *Chronik*, 94. A letter, Grossmann - Deindoerfer, St. Sebald, May 8, 1870, welcomes the plan but mentions no difficulties. All letters in I. S. D.

The synod very urgently invited Bauer to come to America in 1869 and again 1870. Doctrinal difficulties had something to do with this, but the motive was partly the consideration that it would be well if Bauer could get a first hand acquaintance with American conditions. Bauer did not feel that he could come and declined both invitations. S. Fritschel, however, went to Europe in 1866 and again in 1870. In neither case were relations with the *Gesellschaft* the primary motive, but in both cases he went to Neuendettelsau to adjust such problems as the coordination of curricula and to strengthen relationships. At the end of the period, J. Deinzer finally accepted an invitation to attend the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the synod in 1879. There was a serious strain in existence at the time which received final adjustment and Deinzer used the occasion to travel extensively and to reestablish an unclouded cordiality.[6]

---

[5] A letter, Der Ausschuss der Abtheilung I der Gesellschaft fuer inn. Mission an das Hochw. Praesidium der Synode Iowa, Neuendettelsau, June 26, 1869, in I. S. D., signed Loehe, Alt, Laurent, Bauer, formally requests the synod to arrange for assistantships, because under the new military law, the age requirement had to be revised downward. A draft of a reply by List in I. S. D. gives the answer of the synod, which is also in *K*. *B*. XII, 23, 179-80. The assistants were to receive

During most of the period the men who were trained at Neuendettelsau were sent to America. Occasionally a candidate

---

$50 plus room and board and were to be ordained only in emergencies. The resolutions were to be reported to Germany.

[6] Letters, Bauer - Grossmann, N. D., July 21, 1869, and February 5, 1871, in I. S. D. reply to invitations and note that S. Fritschel in 1870 had done his best to second them. Although the Gesellschaft offered leave and travel expenses and although he saw the advantages of personal acquaintance with American conditions, he felt that his duties must keep him at his post and that difficulties had been satisfactorily adjusted already. The writer cannot state with certainty what lay behind the original invitation, but there is evidence that Bauer had not approved of concessions made to Missouri when a colloquy had taken place in 1867. This point will receive attention in a later chapter, here it need only be stated that this was probably the chief reason. The convention of 1869 renewed the invitation for the next year and suggested that several special pastoral conferences be arranged, since no convention was planned for 1870. An undated draft of a reply by List to Pastor Wucherer who was head of division I of the Gesellschaft in I. S. D. contains the invitation, and asks Wucherer's support. S. Fritschel's two visits also will receive further mention. In 1866 he went primarily to obtain opinions from German theologians on Iowa's doctrinal position. He attended the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Gesellschaft and delivered one of the addresses on that occasion, Correspondenzblatt, 1866, 10 and 11, 39. He is there designated as official representative of the synod, p. 37. Part of his address is given K. M. 1866, 12, 49, 50. In 1870 the purpose of the voyage was the establishment of other German connections. He at this time arranged the details of the coordinated seminary course, Chronik, 94. Deinzer's visit also will receive later mention. It is described at length in a series of travel reports from K. M. which ran in the K. B. beginning XXIII, 5.

was retained in Europe and toward the end of the period another mission was opened in Australia, but in the main the Missionsanstalt was preparing men for the Iowa Synod. Occasionally a combination of circumstances, such as withdrawals from the course, decision of candidates to take advanced work, or European calls reduced the size of the graduating classes, but in only two of the years, 1867 and 1876, were there no candidates for America at all. From 1864 to 1879 a total of thirty-nine candidates were sent and in addition at least ten students who occasionally entered the college, but usually the seminary. Besides that, occasionally men trained elsewhere established contact with the Gesellschaft and were sent to the Iowa Synod.[7]

During the late sixties a second focus of missionary interest and enterprise, which in the next decade was to grow into an additional source of manpower for the synod was developing in Hesse. Grossmann had friends there and S. Fritschel had visited Hesse among other regions on the occasion of his first visit in 1860-61 and it seems probable in the light of subsequent developments that he must have been there again in 1866. At the convention of 1868 the president reported among other accessions, the reception of Pastor J. Baumbach from Hesse, who had become his assistant at St. Sebald. He also reported that a Pastor Huth in grand ducal Hesse had, upon receiving a report from Baumbach, undertaken in conjunction with other pastors to give preliminary training to a number of students, who were to be sent to Wartburg to complete their studies.[8] In the next year he reported that Bauer had attended a conference of Hessian pastors, who had decided to open a school where students would be trained for a year, in preparation for Wartburg or Neuendettelsau.[9] This project does not seem to have materialized and when S. Fritschel was in Europe again in 1870 the outbreak of war prevented him from making contacts in that area.[10]

---

[7] Most of the emissaries can be traced in annual reports of the Gesellschaft and in travel notices in K. M. The list is: 1864, Leupold, Kuechle; 1865, Strauss, Grimm, Fikenscher, Helbig; 1866, Fuehr, Reck; 1868, C. Hoerig; 1869, Beroset, Luz, Preller, Sessler; 1870, Braeuer, Feistner, Flier, Hecke; 1871, Blessin, Hacker, Probst; 1872, Hertel, Mutschmann, Rausch; 1873, Bucka, Kuempflein, Th. Meier, Poeverlein; 1874, Knappe, Kraeling, Poetzinger; 1875, Butzke; 1877, Drexel, Haag, Hertlein, H. Hoerig, A. Meyer; 1878, Caselmann, Liedke, Schmidtkonz. Students are listed for 1869, J. Lannddeck, T. Mueller, who went to Galena; 1870, Christ, Strassburger; 1871, Lenz, Rehn; 1872, Hartmann; 1873, G. Meier, Hebler; 1874, Wacke. In 1873 Candidates Hirschmann and Ficken were sent, who had not studied at Neuendettelsau.

---

[8] K. B. XI, 21, 161 (Baumbach) and 164. Five students were reported, but the writer has been unable to discover whether they ever came to America. Perhaps Candidate Schwan who was reported in 1871 as coming from there was one of them, K. B. XIV, 14, 105. Huth was also sending funds to the seminary. Grossmann hoped that more students would come from this source. Grossmann may have developed the original contacts in this area himself, K. B. IX, 5, 33-7 brings a letter from him to an old friend, Dieffenbach, in which he describes the history and activities of the synod and requests him to interest students and also to meet S. Fritschel then in Europe.

[9] K. B. XII, 18, 143. These were younger students who might go to the college or the seminary on arrival. Although Grossmann reported the engagement of a teacher, there is no further mention of such a school. Hessians, however, for a time at least were connected with the preparatory school at Neuendettelsau, Chronik, 93.

S. Fritschel did, however, make contacts farther north in electoral Hesse. This region had recently been incorporated in Prussia and its church was being assimilated into the Prussian state church or Union, which combined Lutheran and Calvinist elements. Lutheran pastors and congregations who resisted this absorption were on the point of a bitter struggle with the state on confessional grounds and were soon to call their movement the Hessian renitence. Pastors who were deposed found a rather welcome outlet for their energies in training men for mission work in America and numbers of young men, or in some instances older men who had been engaged in teaching and lost their positions because of participation in the renitence, became interested in going to America. It was in the early stages of this resistance movement that S. Fritschel made contacts with Metropolitan Vilmar at Melsungen, a learned and venerable clergyman, who became greatly interested in the Iowa Synod. Although there were peculiarities in the Hessian confessional position which later were to cause difficulty, the two men were able to arrive at doctrinal agreement and Vilmar undertook to establish a Missionshaus, a school which would give preliminary training and then send its students on to Wartburg.[11]

---

[10] K. B. XIV, 13, 98.

[11] Ibid. Grossmann stated only in general terms that support with men was obtained in electoral Hesse. Chronik, 95,

Vilmar was able to organize his school during 1871, occupying quarters in a school for German boys operated by his son and financed by profits from that school and the Melsungen parish. He soon had several students and was asking for information on the curriculum and the house rules at Wartburg, so that instruction and regulations could be articulated with those of the Iowa seminary. In addition he wished to have information about conditions in Iowa, for he believed that numerous Hessians wished to emigrate and he desired to direct them to Lutheran communities, lest they become unchurched. Before long he was also laying plans for the publication of a Melsunger Missionsblatt to serve these causes and asked for a regular flow of church news from America.[12]

---

mentions establishment of the Missionshaus in 1871 and credits S. Fritschel who preached at Melsungen in 1870 with the arrangement. Letters from Vilmar to be cited subsequently indicate doctrinal discussion and agreement. The Hessians recognized only one symbol, the Augsburg Confession. Other symbolical writings were generally acceptable, but they objected to the doctrine of the communicatio idiomatum as presented in the Formula of Concord. This point does not seem to have been discussed.

[12] K. B. XIV, 6, 44-6, reported the establishment of the Missionshaus and noted that its students were to take their last year at Wartburg. It published Vilmar's announcement dated, December 4, 1870, which referred to S. Fritschel's visit and to local support and gave general information about the Iowa Synod. Letters, Vilmar - S. Fritschel, Melsungen, October 19, 1870; March 14; May 10, 1871, in I. S. D., indicate that Vilmar had one student (Vollmar) in training before the school was organized and began it with three; and contain the information in the text, making it appear that profits from the school of the younger Vilmar were the chief revenue.

The first student may have left for America in 1871.[13] By 1873 Vilmar had a class ready, consisting of four students, who were to leave together with a contingent of Neuendettelsau men.[14] They were sent fully equipped and at Melsungen expense as were the graduates of Neuendettelsau. In some cases at least the synod was expected to support them at the seminary, although small sums seem to have been furnished for personal

---

The last letter writes about the Missionsblatt. Apparently Vilmar desired American church publications for he noted that both he and his son read English. He did not wish doctrinal material. The paper was founded, but it does not appear to have received much American news. Melsunger Missionsblatt, V, 5, 59, indicates that the Missionshaus had by 1876 acquired its own building.

[13] It is not clear just when Vilmar sent Vollmar. The letter of October 19, 1870, indicates that he might be sent at once, because he stood in danger of conscription if the Franco-Prussian War should last much longer, since he was then eighteen. According to the letter of March 14, 1871, he was still there, but his entire family wished to migrate and he was apparently putting off departure until they could arrange to go. He is next mentioned in another letter, Vilmar - Grossmann, Melsungen, February 16, 1874, in I. S. D. as ready to graduate from Wartburg with two of those sent in 1873 and with the remark that he had left too early and too hastily. So he may have gone in 1871 and certainly before 1873.

[14] A letter, Vilmar - Grossmann, Melsungen, March 28, 1873, in I. S. D. gives this information and briefly characterizes each of the four, Landgrebe, Mardorf, Decker, Lotz.

expenses.[15] Presumably the proposed articulation of curriculum was established, for Melsungen men seem never to have come as candidates, but to have entered the seminary and graduated there.[16] Like Neuendettelsau the institution did not become large, but it flourished and soon was sending three or four men each year.[17] By 1879 at least thirty men, some of them teachers, had been sent.[18]

---

[15] Vilmar's letter of October 19, 1870, mentions that Melsungen would stand the traveling expenses, if Vollmar were then sent, but that the seminary would have to support him, since he was poor. That of February 16, 1874, mentions a request for funds by one of the Melsungen students then at Wartburg. It notes that the request could not be met and that he had been fully equipped. It adds that annual contributions would be sent for poor students supported by the seminary, but that it could not be much, since Melsungen had little to spare for such purposes.

[16] Melsunger Missionsblatt, IV, 2, carried the order of the day at Melsungen, which was rather similar to that at the seminary. Rising bell, 5:45; chapel, 6:00; private devotion, 6:30; breakfast, 7:00; classes, 8:00-12:00 and so on to retiring bell at 11:00.

[17] In 1873-75 the numbers seem to have been larger, because men were sent both in the spring and in the fall. Besides the four already noted for 1873, the letter of February 16, 1874, mentions three more who had been sent. Other letters, Vilmar - Grossmann, Melsungen, August 6, 1874, and August 6, 1875, in I. S. D. mention five and seven respectively as having sailed or due to sail, as well as several other names without specification.

[18] In addition to the five already named, the following names appear in the cited letters or in Melsunger Missionsblatt, V, 3, 21; 12, 98. W. Engelbrecht, Fage, Giesel, Kuesthardt, Mensing, Nau, Schink, Hein, Staehling, Stumpf, Stauffenberg for 1874; O. Kloeckner, Recknagel, Schlutz, Wittig for 1875; Bess, Hast, Hueter, Reinhard, Helw. Staehling probably 1876; B. Kraushaar, Katzwinkel, Hartwig for 1877; Grode, 1878. Of these Fage was ready for ordination, but does not appear on the roster of pastors, so that he probably never entered the synod. Stumpf, Stauffenberg, and Wittig were teachers, the latter two went to Wartburg and became pastors, but Stumpf

Before the end of the period, however, the relationship with Melsungen was seriously disturbed. Three students at Mendota who had come from Melsungen, raised a number of objections to synodical requirements and stubbornly insisted upon their position. They withdrew from the seminary and the congregation and established a conventicle of their own and in cooperation with Pastor Abee', sought to establish Hessian peculiarities in the congregation at Fort Madison. After Abee' had been recalled they maintained themselves at Mendota, where Abee' died. Vilmar reprimanded their conduct and sought to effect a reconciliation. Renewed negotiations, however, broke down, when the students refused to reply to questions submitted to them. They broke both with synod and with Melsungen and maintained their own little group in isolation.[19]

---

never entered the ministry. B. Kraushaar, Hartwig and Katzwinkel also a former teacher, withdrew from Mendota and Grode may not have been received, because of the difficulties then arising. An ordained Pastor Abee' also came through Melsungen and withdrew after brief service. The list of names is not complete. Besides a second Kraushaar who was to render distinguished service at the college, there was a second Kloeckner and a total of five Staehlings and there may have been others. Some of these may have come after 1879, but a third of the Staehling brothers was ordained in 1879.

[19] Kirchliche Zeitschrift (hereafter cited as K. Z.), III, 3, 65-73. This is a reply to Vilmar's doctrinal statement of which mention will be made, from which many of the facts presented can be gleaned. The portion of the seminary report to the convention of 1879, dealing with the three students (B. Kraushaar, Katzwinkel, Hartwig) only, is printed in Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 243-4. They objected to the name Lutheran and called themselves Lower Hessian Reformed Renitent and rejected the confessions, except for the Augustana, and the doctrine of the communicatio idiomatum.

While Vilmar rejected and deplored the conduct of this group, he sympathized with their viewpoint and presented the case in the Melsunger Missionsblatt and had this representation reprinted and circulated as a pamphlet. The faculty of the seminary published a reply in the Kirchliche Zeitschrift. Subsequently a series of questions was formulated which was to be submitted to every applicant from Melsungen for admission to the seminary, their answers to determine whether the application could be granted or not. While Vilmar obviously did not wish to break off relations and apparently sent a group of men as late as 1880, the institution of this practice led to a breach as a result of which Melsungen ceased to send students to Wartburg.[20]

Abee' insisted rigidly upon a controversial Hessian order and all declared themselves bound by Hessian tradition and church order. A letter, Abee' - Prof. ?, Fort Madison, December 8, 1877, in I. S. D. indicates his position and writes of his removal from that parish. His death is noted in a letter, Grossmann - --, May 27, 1878, in I. S. D.

[20] The reply from Mendota was cited in footnote 19. Neither the issues of the Melsunger Missionsblatt, containing Vilmar's presentation nor the pamphlet were available to the writer. Vilmar's position is described in two long letters, Vilmar - S. Fritschel, Melsungen, October 26; December 9, 1877, in I. S. D. The Hessian church accepted the Augustana as a confession, because it laid down fundamental truths over against Rome. The other symbols were doctrine and occupied subordinate rank. His position on the Eucharist seems to have been quasi-Calvinist. The faculty noted the Iowa position which recognized open questions against narrow dogmatism, but insisted upon staunch adherence to Lutheran principle. In several additional letters, Vilmar - S. Fritschel, Melsungen, January 25; April 13; April 29; July 2, 1878, in I. S. D. Vilmar discussed individuals and relationships. The first indicates that thirteen questions were asked of the dissidents and first indicates approval of their basic position. The second indicated that he would send five hundred copies of his pamphlet and asked that they be advertised in the K. B. which

A third source of manpower for the synod was established in northern Germany, in Mecklenburg. An organization known as the Gotteskasten with branches in various German states, devoted to missionary enterprise, was established there. S. Fritschel made contacts with this area and with the organization on his first visit to Europe. Again it is possible that these were strengthened on the second visit for the presidential report of 1868 mentioned support from old friends in northern Germany and the list of ordinations in 1869 contained the name of Pastor Engel, who had come from Mecklenburg.[21] The third visit in 1870 seems to have had the particular purpose of establishing closer relationships with this area.[22]

---

was not done. The third expressed strong interest in Hartwig and Kraushaar, though he disapproved of a private burial which the group had given Abee'. The fourth indicates that Vilmar considered the connection indissoluble despite the Iowa reply to his pamphlet and announces another student. An undated letter, Grossmann - --, in I. S. D. expresses the opinion that Vilmar believed S. Fritschel to agree with him and rejoices that the latter stood entirely with the faculty, while an unsigned and unaddressed letter, Mendota, September 18, 1880, refers to five recent arrivals, also mentioned in the Grossmann letter, and indicates that the established procedure would be followed, noting that Vilmar had given the arrivals no instructions on the questions, and anticipates no trouble. No indication is given as to who the five were. Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 243, states that the relationship was broken in consequence of these developments.

[21] The presidential report is in K. B. XI, 21, 163. Chronik reports the ordination, p. 91 and p. 95 states in connection with his death which occurred a year later, that he came from Mecklenburg.

[22] K. B. XII, 24, 190. The convention of 1869 resolved this.

As a result an arrangement was made under which students were to be given preliminary training for entrance into the seminary of the synod. A proseminary was established in a teachers' seminary at Luebtheen in Mecklenburg under the direction of Pastor Chrestin.[23]

This connection with the Mecklenburg Gotteskasten was maintained not only through the rest of the period, but through the following one into the twentieth century. It did not furnish as many men by 1879 as did Melsungen or Neuendettelsau, but it functioned without serious disturbance. Arrangements in regard to articulation of instruction are not reported, perhaps there was no necessity for them, since students were prepared to enter theological instruction at Wartburg. It seems probable also that some of the men who came from Luebtheen entered the college rather than the seminary. No information in regard to pecuniary arrangements could be found, but since there are no records in the seventies dealing with travel costs it is most likely that the Gotteskasten made similar provisions for its emissaries as did the other German organizations, while the failure of the seminary to collect much in the way of student payments probably indicates that those of the Luebtheen students who had no private means received synodical support and gave notes for the minimum payments. By 1879 at least ten students had been received from this source.[24]

---

[23] Chronik, 99.

There were well known mission schools in Germany at Leipzig and Hermannsburg. Neither ever entered into formal relationships with the Iowa Synod. It may have been in the mind of synodical leaders to approach Leipzig, for when S. Fritschel went to Europe in 1870 he attended a conference at Leipzig and spoke there.[25] If so, he did not suceed, for Leipzig did not send men to Wartburg, although occasionally a man who had been at Leipzig went to Neuendettelsau and from there to America. Hermannsburg was oriented toward Missouri at this time and is not mentioned in the account of the third visit. However a few men who had begun their training there came to Wartburg to complete it and were ordained in the synod in the early seventies.[26] A few individual pastors also trained young men for entrance into the seminary. Pastor H. Schedler in Hesse thus sent J. Becker, a gifted youth from his parish, whose means did not permit him to go to Melsungen and wrote, when relations with that school became strained, that his son and several others were also being prepared by him.[27] Pastor Woelter in Wuerttemberg discussed similar plans with S. Fritschel in 1870 and several years later offered to prepare Jewish proselytes for theological study.[28]

---

[24] There is but little material on relations with Luebtheen. Only two letters from Chrestin are in the I. S. D. and the K. B. gives Luebtheen only an occasional brief mention. If it had an organ of its own like K. M. or Melsunger Missionsblatt, the writer has not found references to it. One letter, Chrestin - S. Fritschel, Buetzow, July 28, 1875, identifies the brothers W. Proehl and C. Proehl and C. Scheffelmann as coming from there. Both Proehls are listed as graduates of Wartburg College in 1875 and 1876 in older editions of the college catalog. Scheffelmann is not, and must therefore have been admitted to the seminary immediately. The writer is unable to identify other Luebtheen emissaries. The seminary report to the convention of 1873 referred to the first four students from there as then in the seminary, which makes it probable that they had come in 1871 and 1872. Chronik, indicates that six of the graduates from the seminary between 1876 and 1879 had come from Luebtheen. Since those who were in the seminary in 1873 must have graduated earlier, the total of ten results. There probably were several more in the seminary, but not graduated.

[25] Chronik, 94; K. B. XIII, 16, 121-2, brings a report from S. Fritschel on the conference. It may be that he merely went there to make contacts with confessional Lutheran leaders.

---

[26] Chronik, 104, gives the names of Buehring, Schulenburg, Wilke in this connection as ordained between the conventions of 1871 and 1873, and also mentions Pastor A. Rehn, who had, however, been received from the Canada Synod and had not been at Wartburg. Buehring and Schulenburg were among those who brought about the schism of 1875. Rehn also left at that time, but returned later. Wilke had a long and honorable career in the synod.

[27] Letters, Schedtler - --, Dreihausen, February 26; June 14, 1878. Becker was to come that year. Schedtler's son came later. He mentioned three others, but gave no names and the writer therefore cannot say, whether they ever came. Schedtler stated that he had never met the addressee, perhaps S. Fritschel.

[28] Letters, Woelter - S. Fritschel, Neckargroeningen, November 23, 1877; June 18; August 5, 1878, in I. S. D. According to the last letter two men were to arrive that year, one of whom, Weiler, was to go to Iowa, though he apparently had another offer. He was never on the roster of synod. A few years later several proselytes did join synod, who may have come through Woelter who was conducting a Jewish mission and was planning establishment of a school.

Germany was thus the chief source of clerical manpower for the Iowa Synod throughout its first twenty-five years. At least forty-five men altogether came ready for ordination or already ordained, chiefly from Neuendettelsau. At least fifty more came to enter the college or the seminary.[29] The latter institution graduated some ninety students within this span of years and must therefore have drawn thirty to forty American students in addition to those who came from Germany. Since a good half of this total was graduated during the last five years and since the proportion of students from German sources was then fully three-fourths, its classes during the first ten years were not only smaller, but must have contained proportionally larger numbers of American students.[30] The synod also received some twenty pastors from other synods into membership during the period, but a good many of these did not stay more than a year or two.[31] It is difficult to give an exact number, but it would seem that about one hundred sixty-five pastors were placed into service altogether. Together with forty-nine who had been in that service by 1864, the total number of pastors during the first quarter century would thus run to two hundred fourteen. Withdrawals, however, were numerous, particularly among accessions from other synods and at the time of the upheaval of 1875. There were also ten deaths and a number of retirements. The total number on the clerical roster in 1879 is given as one hundred thirty-six.[32]

---

[29] Two candidates who came through but not from Neuendettelsau and thirty-nine of its own candidates have been listed in footnote 7. Four others were Engel, Baumbach, Foelsch and Abee'. In addition ten students were listed as coming from Neuendettelsau and at least thirty from Melsungen as well as at least ten from Luebtheen. Since there were a few from other sources, there were probably actually fifty-five to sixty such students, though not all may have gone on to complete their course or have been able to do so by 1879. Very nearly fifty, however, had entered the ministry by that year.

[30] Since the seminary did not issue a catalog at that time and since not all reports to synodical conventions are extant, there is no exact contemporary record of the graduates. From ordination records in Chronik and from rosters given there or in the K. B. the writer calculates that ninety-five to ninety-seven men were ordained, who had received part or all of their training at the seminary.

So great an increase in manpower made it possible for the synod greatly to expand its missionary activities and to increase the number of parishes as well as to extend the area served. At various times the question of employing traveling missionaries or Reiseprediger came up again, but the old lack of means to support such men remained so great a handicap that not until near the end of the period was it possible to do much toward providing them on a regular basis. At the convention of 1867 the president's report, while discussing mission work as a primary function of synod, suggested that, while regularly employed Reiseprediger would serve the purpose best, a feasible way of meeting the need would be to have each conference select a qualified man and make it possible for him to go on missionary travels from time to time, noting that in some areas this was already being done. The convention responded by ordering each conference to establish a treasury for Reiseprediger and to have conference members travel and make reports to the president.[33]

---

[31] Most of these accessions came in the late sixties as a result of rapprochement with other church bodies and left as the friendship cooled or withdrew later. Since this development will receive attention later, the writer will omit details and documentation at this point.

[32] Chronik, 143, gives the number one hundred thirty-six. It may not include the ordinations of that year. If all men whose names appear from time to time are added and all reported deaths and withdrawals are subtracted, the 1879 number should be one hundred forty-two, according to the writer's calculations. It is probable that there were several additional withdrawals of which no record was found. If the ordinations of 1879 are added to the one hundred thirty-six, the total would be one hundred thirty-nine. The number forty-nine had by 1864 been reduced by death and withdrawal to forty-one as was noted in chapter VIII.

At the time of the next convention the president had no report on the establishment of such treasuries from any conference, though he noted that a tract written for distribution by Reiseprediger was ready for distribution.[34] Some conferences seem to have complied, but there is no evidence of general enforcement of the resolutions of 1867 during the succeeding years. The convention of 1871 again took the problem under consideration. A committee called attention to missionary opportunities in western Iowa. Discussion from the floor pointed out others in western Missouri and Kansas. It was suggested that pastors who knew of such opportunities should arrange to travel through the areas when convenient. Mature seminarians might substitute for them or also travel under supervision. As to means, pastors might hold mission study circles in the congregations and raise offerings. Conferences which still had treasuries for Reiseprediger might use them and still existing mission funds might also be applied. The convention resolved that such travel should be carried on in whatever ways were possible with the use of the suggested funds. The president was to assume direction and make arrangements so that pastors might travel or furnish them assistants whose travels they might direct.[35]

---

[33] The manuscript of the president's report in 1867 is in I. S. D. and there is also Zusammenstellung, 1867, which brings the resolution. The report noted that such activities had been carried on in Illinois and in Wisconsin, resulting in acquisition of several congregations, the most important of which was Mendota.

[34] Zusammenstellung 1867 marked with notes on enforcement in I. S. D.

Again it is not possible to trace enforcement of a rather vague set of provisions, but the expansion of synod is evidence that missionary fervor was not lacking, and evidence does exist that individual pastors or conferences surveyed their areas and made efforts to reach the unchurched.[36]

---

[35] Chronik, 97; K. B. XIV, 21, 161-2.

[36] A letter, Vogel - Grossmann, June 13, 1872, in I. S. D. reports that the Wisconsin Conference felt that its growth was lagging behind that of other areas. There were only six parishes in one of the oldest districts served by the synod.

As the synod grew stronger, however, it began to appear feasible to employ Reiseprediger on a larger scale. The Western District at its convention of 1877 resolved to establish a treasury for that purpose and to appoint a district Reiseprediger, whose reports were to appear in the Kirchenblatt.[37] In the next year the Eastern District resolved to support this undertaking.[38] Pastor Hast was appointed and sent into Nebraska and Kansas. In the former state he travelled extensively in Gage, Clay, Saline, Seward, Kearney, Buffalo, Franklin and Harlan Counties, locating scattered

---

It had resolved that each pastor was to look after unchurched areas in his vicinity and if possible to open new missions. The southwestern part of the state was out of reach for all of them, yet there were evidences of Lutheranism in that area. Could a seminary graduate be assigned to this area at conference expense? He might be assigned to Boscobel or Madison. Bredow, Erinnerungen, 103-44 describes Bredow's missionary activities from Maxfield in Bremer and adjoining counties from which a number of congregations resulted which called their own pastors.

[37] K. B. XX, 23, 178-9. Support was to come from conferences, offerings were to be lifted at weddings and similar occasions, the mission study circles were to be employed regularly and profits from the sale of literature by Reiseprediger were to be turned back into it. Conferences were to study opportunities and to apply to the district president who was to direct the work.

[38] K. B. XXI, 15, 115. Its president had reported that the district had no need of its own Reiseprediger, but urged support for the work in the west, 14, 106.

groups of German settlers, but finding the more promising areas already occupied. He organized a congregation near Minden, whose call he eventually accepted himself and began organizing another at Alma in the Republican Valley. In Kansas he confined himself to several north central counties and founded congregations at Phillipsburg and in Smith County.[39] Pastor Reck spent half a year in southern Minnesota, northern Iowa and went into the eastern reaches of Dakota Territory. He found competition from other synods and particularly from Methodist missionaries, who had won over many neglected Germans, but founded several congregations in Mower, Martin and Faribault Counties in Minnesota and one at Sibley in western Iowa, but none in Dakota and then also accepted a call.[40]

---

[39] Hast's travels are recorded in K. B. XXI, 13, 97-8; 15, 112-13; 18, 137-8; XXII, 4, 25. He returned from Kansas to Minden and then went back to the Republican Valley, founding a congregation at Arapaho, which may have replaced the earlier group at Alma. He intended to go back to Kansas, but his horse gave out and so he took the call to Minden. He appended an appeal to settlers to come to Nebraska, advised them as to land costs and methods of settlement. The Burlington railway, according to him, gave the best terms as to virgin lands, but it was best to buy from overextended settlers, a partly improved quarter section could thus be had for from $150-$200. It was best to come out in late winter, seed rented land and spend the summer breaking and building a sod house, taking a crop from the rented land the first year.

[40] For Reck's travels see K. B. XXII, 3, 18, 19; 4, 25-6; 5, 33-6. He travelled in winter, partly on foot and repeated the old complaint of sore feet. Dakota he found promising, but lacked means for going far into it. Reck's call did not come from the field he had visited. Hast's travels had occurred in 1878, Chronik, 140, Reck's not mentioned until the next year, p. 155, probably occurred in the winter 1878-9, Ibid. Pastor Niederwimmer is also mentioned, presumably he was appointed after Reck took a congregation. He was later stationed in the west, so he probably went to Nebraska or Kansas.

A promising beginning was thus made in this long projected type of work in 1878. Another Reiseprediger seems to have been chosen to replace the first two. It does not seem to have been planned that the missionaries should resign and devote themselves to individual congregations, but men could hardly be expected to continue arduous travels indefinitely and it may have been best to replace them after brief intervals. At any rate the pattern was to be followed thereafter, a Reiseprediger opened a region, accepted a congregation and had pastors called to others and a new Reiseprediger carried on the work farther afield. Neuendettelsau immediately took note of the new venture and laid plans for its support.[41] Interest in the synod too seems to have run high, for the convention of 1879 after receiving the German gift, which was to aid the work for two years, resolved to take over the direction from the Western District and to place it with appropriate regulations under the supervision of a synodical mission board.[42]

---

[41] K. M., N. F. IX, 9, 65-7. It was suggested that 900 Mark be contributed for two years. Iowa was to choose the Reiseprediger, preferably a Neuendettelsau graduate. The Gesellschaft would get the right of first publication of his report. He was to go westward to the states where missions were being founded or even to California. Assistance may have been requested, since it was stated that it was difficult for Iowa to support the work. A letter, Deinzer - Deindoerfer, Neuendettelsau, October 5, 1878, in I. S. D. definitely promises 1,000 Mark for two years, but states that support beyond that period could not be promised. This amount was given, Chronik, 145. Synod resolved official thanks, the letter follows pp. 145-6 and is printed Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 215-6.

[42] Chronik, 155. No details are given. The establishment of a central mission board thus came at the end of the

If it was thus only at the end of the period that organized mission work could be put on a basis that had long seemed desirable, missionary endeavor had throughout the period been establishing new parishes within and beyond the areas of 1864. In Iowa, at the time of the convention of 1867, the first of the period, the synod had fifteen pastors, by 1879 the number had grown to forty.[43] By 1869 the synod had twenty-one parishes in its home state. Several of the older parishes had been divided, such as that at West Union. Or a mission, as at Bellevue, had become independent and had called its own pastor. Several pastors had come in with their congregations from other synods, in this way parishes at Wilton and Farmington had been added. A new congregation had been founded at Cedar Falls.[44] During the next two years the rate of increase was slower, but an existing congregation was taken over at Iowa City and congregations were established at New Hampton and Ionia and at Rock Creek near Mitchell.[45] Between 1871 and 1875 there was again rapid growth. Along the eastern river boundary the synod acquired congregations at

---

period and a discussion of its activities belongs into the next division.

[43] Attendance statistics for the convention of 1867 are in Chronik, 80. They give pastors present and absent by states. Those for 1879 are in Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 194. In 1867 two theological professors and in 1879 two instructors at the new teachers' seminary are included and there were accordingly two parishes less in each case.

[44] Compiled from the attendance list at the convention of 1871 in K. B. XII, 18, 140-1.

[45] Chronik, 100. See also Bredow, Errinnerungen, 103-44.

Davenport and Fort Madison in addition another already occupied at Burlington. In the southwest the first footholds were secured at Walnut and as early as 1869 near Council Bluffs. The greatest expansion, however, took place in the northeast, where the seminary was still an active center of missionary effort, resulting in a number of preaching places and a new congregation at Earlville and where Pastor Bredow at Maxfield reached far out into his environs. Such congregations as those at Waverly, Charles City, Greene, Waterloo, and Independence were among those founded during these years.[46]

A considerable number of Iowa pastors were among those who left the synod during the upheaval of 1875, but their withdrawal did not always result in the loss of the parishes they served. Lost were the old congregations at Des Moines and at Elkport and several of more recent origin, such as Kalona in the southeast and Walnut in the southwest, while the congregation at Wilton was split.[47] Growth between 1875 and 1879 was less rapid than during the immediately preceding years, but it was quite sufficient to make good the losses and to show another increase as the anniversary year was reached. Again it was especially in the northeast where such congregations as Strawberry Point, Sumner, Readlyn, Tripoli, and Sheffield were formed or became independent. The first congregations in the northwest, were founded in Lyon County in

---

[46] Chronik, 103, 116, 119, 130.

[47] Chronik, 136, 139, 142, 159.

1878 and Boyden followed in 1879.[48] At the end of the period approximately one-third of the parishes served by the synod were in Iowa. They were unevenly distributed. The beginning had been made in the northeast and there the greatest concentration of strength was developed, although its center lay one hundred miles to the westward of Dubuque. Even St. Sebald lay on the eastern fringe of this area. A series of congregations ranged from Dubuque southward along the river, but the synod held only scattered positions throughout the southern half of the state. In the west only footholds had as yet been developed.

In Wisconsin there was little growth for some time. In 1869 there were still only six parishes, Madison, Cottage Grove, Westfield, Honey Creek, Boscobel and Prairie du Chien. The state had a large German population, but the earlier strict practices of the synod had not appealed and in consequence several of the beginnings noted in chapter VII had been abandoned, and the synod seems to have concentrated greater efforts elsewhere. Early in the second period several pastors in Wisconsin withdrew because of doctrinal reasons. A schism had cost a part of the Westfield parish and the synod also had to abandon the remnant of the old congregation at Platteville. The Wisconsin Synod was active and growing. All these factors explain the lack of vigorous expansion in the area. Even in 1872 there were still only the six parishes, but in that year a measure of growth began with the acquisition of a congregation at Eau Claire.[49] In the next year Pastor L. W. Habel, whose call to Buffalo had given the synod its first congregation in Wisconsin in 1855, and who now had formed an organization which he called the Bruderbund from several congregations of the Buffalo Synod which in the meantime had undergone several serious schisms, visited the convention at Davenport and asked for assistance. The men sent would remain members of Iowa and perhaps in time his organization would affiliate with the synod. He was given an assistant and after his death in the same year, the synod acquired the congregation at Cedarburg, though the Bruderbund as such did not affiliate.[50]

---

[48] *Chronik*, 142, 158.

Although the rate of growth was not rapid, there was a steady increase in Wisconsin thereafter. Several congregations formerly served by the Wisconsin Synod, such as Watertown, were taken over. In some instances these acquisitions occasioned difficulty and were not permanent.[51] The upheaval of 1875 took only one pastor from Wisconsin, who subsequently returned, but he took the old congregation at Prairie du Chien along, which was lost permanently.[52] Among the accessions were Avoca, Baraboo, Brandon and Grafton.[53] On the whole the expansion in this area was not great, in 1879 thirteen parishes existed in Wisconsin, but a firmer foundation for future growth had been laid. In proportion to the number of congregations the ratio of loss had been high throughout the quarter century.

---

[49] See the first source cited in footnote 36 for efforts inaugurated in that year. The candidate requested may have been sent, for a beginning was made at Harrisville, besides the acquisition of Eau Claire, Chronik, 103.

[50] K. B. XXI, 23, 177. Habel's personal attendance is noted Ibid., 19, 148. His death and the succession of Pastor Strassburger, his assistant, is noted Chronik, 177. The Bruderbund (league of brothers), was too small to maintain a seminary. Several letters in I. S. D. deal with this episode. Habel - Grossmann, May 1; May 20, 1873, opens the question of getting support, indicates that the Bruderbund was an interim measure and that Habel feared that its members would go to Missouri after his death, while another Habel - Grossmann, October 1873, expresses full satisfaction with Strassburger. Two others, Strassburger - Grossmann, Cedarburg, - -, 1873, May 27, 1874, note Habel's death and the continuation of the Bruderbund, although the leading congregation outside of Cedarburg had gone to Ohio.

During the first ten years the synod had not worked extensively in Illinois. From Dubuque the old parishes at Rush Creek and Galena had been founded in the extreme northeast and in the far south congregations were served at Jonesboro, Metropolis, Cairo and Colconda. Between 1865 and 1879 activities in Illinois were so greatly extended, that by the latter year the synod had more parishes in that state than in any other except Iowa. By 1869 footholds had been secured in the central section of northern Illinois through the acquisition of the congregations at Mendota and Clarion.[54] By that time too the location of the college at Galena had transferred one of the essential synodical activities into that state. When the seminary also was transferred to Mendota in 1874 and Grossmann moved there with it, the headquarters of the synod were removed from Iowa and located in Illinois. This and the lack of a group of congregations in the Mendota vicinity were indeed grounds for a certain amount of opposition to this venture.[55] When in 1875 the college also was transferred to Mendota, that city acquired the prominence in synodical affairs which had formerly been held by St. Sebald, and despite the later return of the president to Iowa, was to hold it throughout the period and well beyond it, though not permanently.

---

[51] Letters, Hacker - Grossmann, Fountain City, October 27; November 12, 1874; March 19, 1878. Hacker took a call from a congregation which had not yet left the Wisconsin Synod, though the president had told him not to accept the call until the relationship should be broken. Wisconsin tried to keep the congregation, but it withdrew. Four years later, however, both it and Hacker went to Wisconsin, Hacker being influenced by a friend, Pastor Probst at Glencoe, who also left. The Watertown parish also originated in a schism within a Wisconsin Synod congregation, see a letter, Vogel - --, Watertown, September 6, 1875, in I. S. D.

[52] Chronik, 123.

[53] Ibid., 118, 139, 141.

---

[54] Mendota is first mentioned in Grossmann's presidential report for 1867, the MS. of which is in I. S. D. Schieferdecker was stationed at Clarion in 1868, *K. B.* XI, 20, 154.

[55] See the references in footnote 64, Chapter XII for contemporary efforts to relocate the seminary in Iowa, which, however, did not stress these objections. Klindworth may have given them stress when proposing a special convention in 1874 in advance of the relocation. The cited letter, Luz - --, June 1, 1874, indicates that he did. Klindworth, *Zeugniss*, 32-3, stresses the conditions in the congregation at Mendota as a reason against having the seminary located there. The accessibility of Mendota no doubt outweighed all such arguments.

While the possibility of friendly cooperation with the Illinois Synod played its part in the removal of the college to Galena, these hopes were not realized. A few pastors of that synod, apparently with their congregations were accepted into membership, but they soon withdrew once more and no permanent gains seem to have been made from this connection. Neglected congregations were, however, taken over in a number of instances. Pastor P. Kleinlein, who himself took such a charge in Keokuk Junction was tireless in searching out such opportunities, but they sometimes led to difficulties.[56] The seminary at Mendota engaged in missionary work in its environment as it had earlier done at St. Sebald, with the result that a considerable number of parishes came into being in that area, such congregations as Dixon, Franklin Grove, Ashton, Earlville, Princeton, Castleton, Walnut calling their own pastors within the period.[57] Farther afield congregations were established at Long Point, Cullom, Chatsworth, Coatsburg, Peoria, Emden, Benson, Anchor, Shobonier and several other places, thus pushing southward farther into the central region.[58]

---

[56] Letters, Kleinlein - Grossmann, Keokuk Junction, July 26; August 24; October 10; November 14; December 4, 1873, in I. S. D. There had been considerable trouble over Kleinlein's own congregation at Keokuk Junction with the Illinois and Missouri Synods, K. B. XVI, 17, 132, cf. Lutheraner XXVII, 21, 162-4; 22, 174 and earlier, 18, 142-3.

[57] Chronik, 130; 135; 159.

[58] Ibid., 116, 135, 136, 139, 142, 159.

Illinois also sustained losses, notably in 1875 when Galena, Fowler and Keokuk Junction left with their pastors and not every promising opportunity could be realized, but on the whole it experienced continuous growth and by the end of the period it had some twenty parishes.[59]

Missouri, together with southern Illinois and Paducah, Kentucky, had formed a conference by 1864. The two congregations near Paducah were never very securely established and the synod had withdrawn from them before 1879, though one of them was again to be served later.[60] In southern Illinois there was less growth than elsewhere in that state. A second congregation was established near Metropolis, but both Cairo and Golconda were abandoned.[61] In Missouri there was considerable expansion, but the synod did not become strong in that state. Altenburg was retained, though the synod would not have objected to its reunion with the Missouri congregation there, when in 1875 both its pastor, Doehler, and its founder, Schieferdecker returned to the Missouri Synod.[62] The congregation at Jackson, formerly served by Pastor Doederlein, had withdrawn after its pastor had joined the Missouri Synod.[63] Jackson was soon replaced when Pocahontas, which had been served from Altenburg became independent. In the same area a congregation at Appleton was acquired. A rather turbulent congregation at Stringtown, in central Missouri, later Lohman, was retained through many difficulties. Pastor Dunsing also moved far into the interior of the state and began work at Richland and Cole Camp, which soon became a separate parish. Other beginnings, destined to grow into separate congregations were made at Brauersville, Pyrmont and Bebra. Between Osage and Taos still another parish was established.[64] In several instances schisms from Missouri congregations were involved. Most of these congregations had been established by 1870, after that there was little growth in Missouri and accordingly the accelerated rate of expansion in the last decade of the period did not affect this area. In 1879 the synod had eight pastors stationed in Missouri.[65]

---

[59] *Chronik*, 134, lists only Galena as lost in 1875, however, the letter of withdrawal for Fowler, Vorstand - Praeses, undated, is in I. S. D. Keokuk Junction is mentioned *K. B.* XX, 21, 162, apparently the congregation had largely broken up. Deindoerfer, *Geschichte*, 194, states that there were twenty-five pastors stationed in Illinois in 1879. This included four at Mendota, but some of them were serving charges.

[60] *Ibid.*, 350. See also footnote 64.

[61] Metropolis is noted *Ibid.*, 351. Cairo troubles are discussed in letters, Thielecke - Grossmann, Cairo, December 5, 1872; Helbig - Grossmann, December 18, 1872, and February 18, 1872 (1873). Helbig was replaced, but there was more trouble under his successor, Duerschner, according to a letter, Thielecke - Grossmann, Cairo, October 30, 1875, which seems to have led to disintegration. Golconda seems to have been abandoned when Pastor Brandstettner left. See also footnote 64. See all letters in I. S. D.

---

[62] A letter, Doehler - Professor (S. Fritschel), Altenburg, July 2, 1875, in I. S. D., announces his withdrawal and a reconciliation attempt suggested by Deindoerfer, then acting president, which failed. An earlier attempt at the time Schieferdecker was leaving the congregation had also failed, see letters, Schieferdecker - Grossmann, Altenburg, June 10, 1866, and Walther - Grossmann, St. Louis, December 6, 1865, in I. S. D. For a reaction from Missouri, see *Lutheraner*, XXXI, 16, 122.

[63] See the letter from Schieferdecker cited in the preceding footnote.

[64] Koeberle, *Bericht des Vice-Praeses des suedl. Districts der evangel. luth. Synode von Iowa*, dated May 25, 1871, in I. S. D., describes the various fields where the synod was working at that time and mentions most of these congregations. It also explains how Paducah was lost and indicates unsatisfactory conditions at Golconda, only Brandstettner, the pastor, but not the congregations could be received into synod.

In the eastern area, the synod considerably expanded the field of its activities both in Ohio and in Michigan. In the early years Pastor Doerfler continued to advocate curtailment of missionary activities in the west in favor of the east, where he felt opportunities to be much greater and even advocated relocation of the seminary in Ohio.[66] Not only was the synod not ready to accept this idea, but Doerfler's hopes proved to be exaggerated, because of competition from other synods. In Michigan, where the synod had six parishes by

---

[65] Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 194.

[66] A letter, Doerfler - S. Fritschel, Toledo, April 2, 1866, in I. S. D. suggests location at Maumee, Ohio. The school should go where it could get students, theological and otherwise, and where they could reach the school. Synod should concentrate its efforts where it could build up strong congregations which could support institutions. Doerfler's primary interest was the orphanage, of which he became superintendent in 1866 and Deindoerfer wrote that he placed it above the synod and had reprimanded one of the eastern pastors for raising offerings for the seminary instead of for it. See a letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, May 31, 1866, in I. S. D. Doerfler later left the synod, but returned some years later and then retired because of ill health.

1864 the number doubled by 1875 and increased to fifteen by 1879.[67] Swan Creek, near Peters, which had left with Pastor Brandt when the friendship with Buffalo had ended in the fifties, returned in the late sixties when Buffalo troubles began. Also from Buffalo came the congregation at Roseville, near Detroit, some years later.[68] New Baltimore in the same vicinity may also have come from Buffalo sources, while Blissfield was separated from the Riga parish. Missions at Alpena and Romeo were successful and in later years, Capac, Cheyboygan and Belknap were added.[69] The synod thus maintained its position in Michigan, but the growth though gratifying was not quite in proportion to the total increase throughout the entire area over which its activities ranged.

In Ohio there were four congregations at the end of the first decade, three of them in or near Toledo. In 1865 the synod established another parish near Cleveland with congregations at Berea and Parma, which later were separated.[70] The chief development, however, was to take place in northwestern Ohio where Candidates Strauss and Grimm of the Neuendettelsau class of 1865 were stationed, assisted by Pastor Kuechle from the preceding year. Work was begun at Archbold, Napoleon or Okolona, Pettisville, Ridgeville Corners, Bryan, Wauseon, Edgerton and extended into Indiana at Wawaka. Difficulties developed both with the Missouri and the Ohio Synods, but the work was extended to such places as Edon and by 1870 there were five parishes, while in the course of time, all these congregations were destined to become independent.[71] Deindoerfer also took a position in this area, when in 1870 he accepted a call from a group in Defiance, which had separated from a Missouri congregation there.[72]

---

[67] Synodalbericht 1875, 4-5, lists twelve pastors as stationed in Michigan and Deindoerfer Geschichte, 194, gives the number as fifteen in 1879.

[68] A letter, Schmidt - Grossmann, Detroit, September 19, 1868, in I. S. D., indicates that the Buffalo pastor at Swan Creek had inquired about acceptance into Iowa. He did not join, but the congregation returned. A visitation report for this parish in 1870 is in I. S. D. Roseville is given Chronik, 139.

[69] New Baltimore is mentioned in a letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Toledo, April 14, 1869, in I. S. D. For the others see Chronik, 100, 103, 136, 139.

[70] The date is in Deindoerfer Geschichte, 351. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Toledo, February 28, 1868, in I. S. D., intimates that its abandonment was under consideration, because of difficulties with Missouri, but it was kept.

---

[71] A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Toledo, March 7, 1867, in I. S. D., discusses the origins of this field. Missouri had been in the area earlier, had not followed up its opportunities, but now made difficulties. Deindoerfer wrote that if they **had** concentrated there instead of competing with Iowa in the west, they could have had the field. Strauss also gave services to a parish established near Napoleon by Pastor Knape of the Ohio Synod, who was old and ill. Knape consented in hopes that Strauss could be induced to join the Ohio Synod. When difficulties developed Strauss withdrew at one time, to join Ohio for the sake of peace, but after further negotiations returned to the synod, taking most of the parish. Letters, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Toledo, February 28, 1868; August 26, 1869; Strauss - Grossmann, February 10; May 14, 1868, in I. S. D., deal with these affairs.

[72] A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, January 14, 1871, in I. S. D., reports his removal, but gives no particulars, except that the people had been badly neglected, especially in regard to school. Pastor Detzer of the Missouri Synod charged, Lutheraner, XXVII, 10, 110, that Deindoerfer had taken the group, after the Pennsylvania Synod had investigated and refused. No reply is on record, but the Iowa Synod at this period was not inclined to heed Missouri protests, since

While missionary activity increased in Michigan after 1870, it diminished in Ohio, only three additional parishes are noted at Custar, Waterville and Hammler.[73] From Pastor Grimm's parish at Edgerton, Ohio, it was attempted for a while to get a foothold in Indiana, where a congregation of some promise was established at Wawaka. Since this parish was too unwieldly, another mission was begun at Ligonier in hopes that the two might form a separate parish. A little later another promising beginning was made at Elkhart. However, both Pastor Grimm and his successor Flier died soon and though an attempt was made to hold the parish, it broke up. Pastor Probst was unable to hold it together and, with his removal, the only outpost of the Synod in this state was lost, thus leaving the eastern area separated from the western congregations in Illinois by the width of Indiana.[74] The synod also acquired a congregation at Wolcottsville, New York,

---

Missouri had taken advantage of a minor division in Dubuque in 1865 to organize an opposition congregation there on the ground that Iowa was heretical.

[73] Chronik, 116, 136, 159.

[74] Letters, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Toledo, October 17, 1865; Defiance, January 14, 1871; Flier - Grossmann, Elkhart, May 17, 1871; Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, December 22, 1871; May 22, 1872; Probst - Grossmann, Elkhart, May 22, 1872, in I. S. D. Grimm had also worked at Goshen. Deindoerfer felt that Probst's inadequacy had lost the parish. Probst's letter indicates that Wawaka as well as Elkhart had disintegrated.

from Buffalo, where the former missionary Krebs was stationed for the rest of the period.[75] Counting the latter, Ohio in 1879 also had fifteen parishes, so that together with Michigan the synod had thirty in this Eastern District in 1879.[76]

Attached to the Eastern District were a few congregations in the south, which came into being during this period, when several pastors for reasons of health established themselves in that region, but maintained for a time at least their connection with the Iowa Synod. Some interest in the south was manifested from time to time, but the synod was not able to extend its regular activities so far.[77] In 1869, however, Pastor Heckel at Mendota was forced by ill health to seek a more salubrious climate. With the consent of synodical officials he went into the south and found a congregation at Knoxville, Tennessee, which called him. Some fifty miles distant he served isolated mountain settlements at Wartburg, Kingston and Point Rock, for which he later obtained Pastor Hirschmann, from the synod, while Pastor Nolte was stationed for a time at Nashville, where Heckel had found another congregation desiring a pastor. After several years Heckel went to Nashville which Nolte had left earlier. Knoxville was to be served from Wartburg, but seems soon to have fallen away. Hirschmann also left Wartburg to make a new beginning at Chattanooga.[78] Both men left the synod in the later years of the period and with their departure the synod lost its outposts in Tennessee.[79]

---

[75] K. M., N. F., VIII, 9, 67.

[76] Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 194.

[77] A letter, Strobel - Grossmann, Wilton, March 5, 1869, called attention to a German settlement at Fredericksburg, Texas, and suggested that the synod gain a foothold there. Letters, Koeberle - Grossmann, Altenburg, May 1; May 26; and undated, 1869, discuss a call from San Antonio, which Koeberle was inclined to accept, partly for personal reasons and partly to establish an Iowa foothold. Grossmann's reply is not extant, but seems to have given consent. Nothing came of this, however. A letter, Wiederaenders - Grossmann, indicates that Wiederaenders had come from Texas to be educated at Wartburg with the expectation that he return there. He did not do so, however. All letters are in I. S. D.

Farther south Pastor Koeberle made a valiant attempt to establish an outpost at Atlanta, Georgia. A group of German residents of that city had made contact with Pastor Dunsing in 1871. Koeberle went there and, after investigation convinced him that the outlook was favorable, accepted a call.[80] Once there, he found the conditions difficult and was soon reduced to teaching in order to support himself. He visited such places as Dalton, Rome, Columbus in Georgia and Selma, Alabama, but though he located German groups, he was not able to establish strong supporting groups. A church was built in Atlanta, Koeberle appealing both to the synod and to wider Lutheran groups for assistance with moderate success. But the congregation remained small. When the Georgia Synod began an English mission, Koeberle could only recommend his charge to the General Council and return to the north. With his withdrawal the Iowa Synod gave up its work in Georgia. It was never destined to establish itself in the South.[81]

---

[78] Letters, Heckel - Grossmann, Mendota, November 11, 1869; Knoxville, May 25; June 10, 1874; Klindworth - Grossmann, May 3, 1871; Hirschmann - Grossmann, Knoxville, May 25, 1872; September 17; October 2, 1874, in I. S. D. The synod thus at one time had three men in Tennessee. Hirschmann intended to continue to serve Wartburg from Chattanooga, 150 miles away. Heckel pleaded for another man for Knoxville, which did not like Hirschmann. The latter does not indicate what became of Knoxville. Heckel had originally considered going to Mobile, Alabama.

[79] Hirschmann went to Missouri during the upheaval of 1875. His withdrawal in a letter, Hirschmann - Grossmann, Chattanooga, August 26, 1875, does not indicate whether or not he would remain at Chattanooga, but the congregation does not again appear in synodical records, neither does Wartburg. Heckel was reported having accepted a call from the South Carolina Synod and therefore withdrawn at the Eastern District convention of 1878, K. B. XXI, 14, 106; 15, 127. It is likely that he parted amicably, because of his isolation. There is no further mention of Nashville.

---

[80] A letter, Koeberle - Grossmann, Altenburg, December 2, 1871, in I. S. D., reports these data. The group promised to build a church and to raise $1,000 toward salary. The pastor might considerably augment that income through teaching. Koeberle was full of hope and was thinking of engaging an assistant for a school. He also wrote of prospects of finding another place in Georgia for Schieferdecker, who also wished to find a place in the south. In the letter cited in footnote 77 Koeberle indicated that reasons of health, his own and his wife's led him to consider a call to the south. The original contact is mentioned in letters, Dunsing - Grossmann, October 23; October 1, 1871, also in I. S. D.

[81] Letters, Koeberle - Grossmann, Atlanta, July 4, 1872; January 6; January 31; March 3; April 24, 1873; August 6; September 12; November -, 1874, in I. S. D. By another letter, Peoria, January -, 1875, also in I. S. D., he was in Peoria by that time. The letters present ups and downs. Originally he received $1,000 through salary and tuition fees from a parochial school, but needed all of that to support a family of ten. Later he gave up the school to teach German privately, mainly to Jewish students, but that failed also when a rabbi began to teach German. In the end Koeberle found it difficult to raise the necessary funds for returning. The group dwindled, he resigned once in 1873, but made new arrangements and stayed on. He wished at all costs to hold the place and to turn it

Less ambitious but more successful attempts were also made to expand the missionary activities of the synod to the north and west of its center in Iowa. Earlier ventures in Minnesota had led to no permanent results, but in 1865 Pastor M. Reck, newly arrived from Neuendettelsau, again was sent into the southern part of that state. Working from Albert Lea as a base, he located a promising field at Spring Valley to the eastward and at Blue Earth and Minnesota Lake toward the west. The latter was eventually lost to Missouri, when synod was unable to comply with pressing requests for a second pastor for the area. Reck then concentrated on the eastern area, establishing himself at Spring Valley. In 1869 he was joined by Pastor Hertrich from the seminary who served congregations at Nunda and Preston.[82]

During his travels Reck had visited other cities such as Austin and Owatonna, without establishing missions. He continued to serve as missionary over a more limited area,

---

over to a single man. He also wished to stay in the south and asked for recommendations to the Pennsylvania Synod. At a later time he left the synod to return to the south with another synod. K. B. XXI, 16, 126, 127, appeals for the church building assistance and mentions the other places visited. Ibid., 23, 181-2, the dedication is reported and gifts from the synod amounting to $99 are acknowledged. Heckel officiated on this occasion. After the church had been built, Koeberle considered the congregation established and asked to be called away, but prospects were gloomy when he left.

[82] Letters, Reck - Grossmann, Albert Lea, June 28; August 8; October 18, 1866; January 13; November 18, 1867; February 3; February 29; MacGregor, May 4; Spring Valley, August 19, 1868; August 17, 1869, in I. S. D. The letters are not entirely clear, but Reck seems to have served the

gathering groups at such places as Grand Meadow, Forestville and Harmony and occasionally seems to have ranged farther afield, for in 1874 he reported organization of a congregation at Fairmont. By 1879 independent parishes had developed at Preston, Grand Meadow and Harmony, while to the west of Fairmont another existed at Welcome.[83] In the meantime Pastors Kretzschmar and Schulenburg had been sent to Minnesota, the former taking over a far flung field at Freeborn in the county of the same name which Reck had also organized and the latter establishing congregations at Meriden and Owatonna. The crisis of 1875 brought severe losses in this new area. Pastor Hertrich had already withdrawn in 1874 and Kretzschmar and Schulenburg followed in 1875, the latter making an attempt to take his congregation along.[84] In 1876 another congrega-

---

western field for a time and then to have resigned. During the vacancy Missouri sent a pastor. He also seems to have served the eastern area from there.

[83] See a letter, Reck - Grossmann, Spring Valley, June 4, 1874, and Pastoralbericht on Spring Valley, dated Ascension Day 1874, in I. S. D. The former mentions the eastern places, the latter Fairmont. Grand Meadow is listed in Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 357, together with a congregation at Elkton founded in 1879. The separation may have taken place at that time, possibly after the anniversary. Chronik lists Grand Meadow, Harmony and Welcome, pp. 103, 118, 126.

[84] A letter, Foelsch - Grossmann, Cedar Falls, May 19, 1872, in I. S. D., notes that the two men were sent to Minnesota and comments favorably on developments there. Meriden is noted in Reck's letter cited in the preceding footnote. It is possible that Meriden too left in 1875, for Deindoerfer does not record it until 1879, p. 353, with the notice that it had been founded earlier. It is not mentioned as leaving, nor does Schulenburg's letter of withdrawal, Schulenburg - S. Fritschel, Meriden, July 1, 1875, in I. S. D., refer to the congregation. Kretzschmar's dealings at the Freeborn parish are dealt with in an unsigned, undated paper, Vom Hoerensagen luegt man gern in I. S. D.

tion was founded in Glenville.[85] The Reiseprediger activities of Pastor Reck at the end of the period have already been described. They gave evidence that the synod was bent upon strengthening its undertakings in Minnesota.

Although its Indian missionaries traveling through Nebraska had reported opportunities at an early date the synod had not secured a foothold in that territory during its first decade. When in 1866 some members of Pastor Hoerlein's congregation at Cottage Grove, Wisconsin, planned to migrate to Nebraska, Hoerlein considered going along both for personal and missionary reasons, but nothing came of that project.[86] Two years later, however, Pastor W. Beckmann, perhaps of the Wisconsin Synod, who had also planned to go at that time and was established near Elk Creek, was received into the synod. Pastor H. Hempeler had also established himself at Helena by that time and a third pastor, J. Ritter was ready to be installed near Talmage.[87] The new field did not grow rapidly and Hempeler at least could maintain himself only with difficulty.[88] Nebraska was one of the areas discussed when the convention of 1873 was considering Reisepreidger activities and as noted already was the first area to which such a missionary was despatched when Pastor Hast was commissioned in 1878. In the meantime Pastor Feistner had established a congregation at Febing near Johnson, Pastor Ehmen had founded the rural congregation at Hanover, Pastor Rehwoldt had organized a church in another rural area at Hickory Grove, near Auburn, and another congregation had come into existence at Clatonia. Work had also been begun at Burr, Syracuse and near Beatrice.[89] At the end of the period Nebraska, where a few

---

[85] Chronik, 126. Deindoerfer, Geschichte gives Minnesota only four pastors in 1879. There were six parishes, without counting Meriden, Grand Meadow and the missions established by Reck, so there must have been a number of vacancies at that time.

[86] A letter, Hoerlein - Grossmann, Cottage Grove, February 10, 1866, in I. S. D., reports this project. Pastors Kluge and Beckmann were soliciting renters for a proposed migration. Kluge soon left Iowa and joined the Wisconsin Synod, perhaps Beckmann also belonged there. Hoerlein thought the region might be healthier and he was interested in homesteading land.

[87] Grossmann visited the Nebraska congregations to dedicate Beckmann's church and to install Ritter, as well as to look for mission opportunities. He visited all three

---

places and travelled elsewhere especially in the vicinity of Beatrice. A report under the title, Drei Wochen in Nebraska appeared K. B., XII, 15, 16, 18, 19. Ritter was bitten by a rattle snake during the visit and came near death.

[88] Hempeler had been in Nebraska at least since 1867, when he appeared as the first pastor stationed there on the list of pastors absent from the convention of that year at Toledo, Chronik, 80. In 1873 his existence was still insecure as indicated in a letter, Brandt - Grossmann, Helena, January 6, 1873, in I. S. D. in which the secretary of the congregation wrote that its members had promised to break additional land for the pastor, so that he could plant sufficient acreage to support himself and pay a farm hand, so that his pastoral work should not be neglected. Hempeler called attention to the growing settlement at Lincoln where synod should station a pastor. The synod recognized the wisdom of this suggestion only fifty years later in the last stages of its existence as a separate body. The suggestion is in a letter, Hempeler - Grossmann, Helena, March 24, 1876, in I. S. D.

[89] Febing is mentioned K. M., N. F., VI, 6, 45. Pastor Feistner wrote to Kaiser Wilhelm I after the Franco-Prussian War requesting captured French guns for a bell for this church. The request was granted and two guns were received weighing 1,500 pounds from which a bell was cast. According

pastors had long been stationed in isolation, was recognized as a mission field ready for rapid development.

The synod had opened a mission in Kansas during its first decade, but after the death of Pastor Sack this venture had been abandoned. Not until the convention of 1873 was Kansas again considered as a missionary field and even that discussion led to no immediate results, not until 1879 was the first congregation organized at Pittsburg. Two years earlier, however, a group of German Russians near Russell had requested a pastor, who was apparently sent though perhaps not on a permanent basis, for a congregation was to develop there, which is still served by the church.[90] The Reiseprediger activities

---

to a later notice, VII, 2, 11, the governor of Nebraska attended the dedication and spoke there. Febing was located near Johnson, the church community is today known as the Muddy. The others are recorded Chronik, 139; 180. Bredow, Erinnerungen, 157-9, reports a visitation tour of Nebraska congregations and mentions the other places, where no congregations had been organized as yet. There must have been several vacancies, for he writes that there were only five pastors in Nebraska at that time. Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 194, gives the number as eight.

[90] For Pittsburg see Chronik, 158. A letter, A. Hackerott-Foelsch, Kill Creek, Kansas, December 23, 1876, in I. S. D., describes the Russell settlement and asks for a pastor able to speak English. Another letter, Foelsch - S. Fritschel, January 4, 1877, suggests student Marr. The latter was sent to northwestern Iowa, but Chronik, 142, places H. Niederwimmer at Germantown, Kansas. He may have remained there until he became Reiseprediger. Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 194, does not mention Kansas, but mentions that two pastors were stationed in two unnamed states and were the only pastors of synod there. These two were probably Wolcottsville, New York, and Pittsburg, Kansas.

late in the period reached north central Kansas, where in the following years a number of parishes came into existence. Dakota Territory drew attention in 1875 when a group of settlers at Odessa asked for pastoral service on a temporary basis, with a view to calling a pastor later, but the synod does not seem to have been in a position to give it.[91] Reck as *Reiseprediger* reached Dakota, but did not organize a church. This area was to receive much attention in the next period, but by 1879 the synod had made no serious endeavor to serve it. It may be mentioned finally that in 1868 the synod had a parish in Maryland[92] and that in 1875 Neuendettelsau credited it with a European outpost at Antwerp in Belgium.[93]

---

[91] A letter, Luz - --, Dubuque, December 11, 1875, in I. S. D., refers to a visit from members of the group seeking aid for building a church, who stated that they had written, he did not know to whom, asking that a pastor of the synod visit them, until they were able to issue a call. The nearest parish of the synod at Welcome, Minnesota, was not organized until the next year.

[92] The president's report in 1868 stated that the synod had one parish with two congregations in Maryland, *K. B.* XI, 21, 161, and lists Pastor Kiesel as received from the English Iowa Synod. In the list of absent members, Kiesel is reported stationed in Maryland, *Ibid.*, 20, 158. It seems probable that Kiesel left for the east soon after his reception, but maintained synodical membership for a time. He was still carried on the membership list in 1869, *Ibid.*, XII, 18, 141, but not on that of 1871, *Ibid.*, XIV, 19, 148-9. Undoubtedly he joined another synod in the east. There is no other mention of Maryland and no record of the parish being received into membership. The synod could hardly attempt to hold so distant and precarious an outpost, after its pastor ended his affiliation.

[93] *K. M.*, *N. F.*, XIII, 5, 34, has a statement that a pastor of the Iowa Synod had been serving a small congregation at Antwerp for some years. A letter, Deinzer - Grossmann, Neuendettelsau, June 21, 1875, in I. S. D., refers to a request from the pastor at Antwerp for assistance, because of illness.

While the synod experienced a steady growth in manpower and missionary activities during the fifteen year period, the rate of growth was slow during the first five years. There was a faster increase during the next five year period, but the heavy losses of 1875 offset the gains in part though by no means entirely. During the last five years growth proceeded rapidly enough to show another sizable increase. There was a tendency during the sixties to spread manpower thinly over an ever growing area. In the seventies the scattered and ineffective missionary enterprises in the south were abandoned, but more effort was put into the missions in states bordering on the central area in Iowa. In the older territory of the synod there was healthy growth in every area. While the eastern field remained isolated it grew to a point where it needed and could maintain an organization of its own. In the west, Iowa, the home state, had the largest number of parishes by far, the proportional increase was even heavier in Illinois, while Wisconsin and Missouri received much less attention. At the end of the period the missionary spirit

---

Deinzer wrote that he had replied that Iowa filled that position and suggested a candidate who was to assist for a year, rather than go to America at once, but asked for immediate instructions. The pastor at Antwerp, C. Hoerig, had been seriously ill and had returned to Europe. He may have wished to retain his membership and received consent to take this charge. It seems likely that the synod considered Antwerp under the care of the Gesellschaft. The writer has been unable to find American mention of it. Hoerig was not given as a member of synod in the lists of pastors present and absent for the conventions of 1873 and 1875.

was strong in all areas, foreshadowing continued development in the fields occupied and an energetic movement forward in the direction of the great plains.

CHAPTER XIV

RESPONSIBILITY: SYNODICAL PRACTICE 1864-1879

While the expansion of the synod brought with it a considerable increase in the number of people under its spiritual care, it is not easy to give a statistical account. Annual parochial reports had been introduced during the first decade, but it had always been difficult to get them for all parishes. In 1865, the president, who was then in charge of this activity, asked the pastors to give not only the customary statistics on membership and pastoral acts, but to include specific information on services, discipline, liturgy, societies, offerings and schools. Not only were there continued complaints in regard to non-compliance, but little of this material was published or preserved.[1] A fairly comprehensive report published in 1873 indicates that the synod then served 3,204 voting members, 9,323 communicants and 17,355 souls. Since about one-fifth of the parishes had not sent reports, the totals should probably be increased by approximately that percentage.[2] For 1879 no statistics were found. Since there were one hundred thirty-six pastors of whom a few were assistants and instructors at educational institutions, there must have been approximately one hundred twenty-five parishes with two hundred to two hundred fifty congregations. A surviving statement that there were approximately 15,000 communicant members would indicate that there were perhaps 5,000 families with probably not quite 30,000 souls.[3]

---

[1] Grossmann's instruction is in *K. B.* VIII, 11, 87. It provided for two separate reports on statistics and on activities. Most of the *Parochialberichte* for 1865 in I. S. D. complied, but in subsequent years many pastors gave only the statistics. The I. S. D. also contains a number of reports for 1866, but after that there are very few. The synod resolved in 1867 to have a form printed, but by 1868 this had not been done, *Zusammenstellung* 1867 annotated for president's report in I. S. D. The forms were probably printed later and not preserved. In 1871 this work had been turned over to the secretary, who published a report in a supplement to *K. B.* XV, 11. List, the secretary, who under the constitution of 1864 was responsible only for minutes and reports of synodical conventions, had offered to relieve Grossmann of sending out forms and tabulating results in 1868 and suggested a form which was to be printed. In 1869 he also offered to take charge of parochial school reports. Letter, List - Grossmann, Cedar Falls, March 14, 1868; Boscobel, December 2, 1869, in I. S. D.

The select group ideal which dominated during the early years had been modified in 1861 and afterward, but the synod continued to stress Christian living and discipline. In 1864 Deindoerfer while dealing with this aspect of policy had frankly admitted that the synod had erred in the past through excessive demands in regard to admissions, discipline and also liturgy and had touched only lightly on the danger of going to the opposite extreme.[4] In 1879 he touched only lightly on past excesses, but stressed strongly the combination of an evangelical spirit with training in discipline and liturgical understanding.[5] The contrast reflects the change of emphasis. The synod remained strongly opposed to laxity in conduct, in many ways its practices remained strict, but the exclusive spirit of earlier days had passed. There were still schisms and losses of congregations and members who rejected the standards of the synod, but they were less common and occurred particularly among groups of mixed Lutheran and Evangelical backgrounds.

---

[2] This report is in *K. B.*, XVI, 24, 187-8, and *Chronik*, 103, also gives much of it with some additional details. There were ninety-two parishes of which seventy-four reported. If the figures are extended over ninety-two on the same basis there were in round numbers 4,000 voters, 11,700 communicants and 21,600 souls. In *K. B.* XV, 94, the editor in commenting on the figures of 1871 had estimated that there were 5,000 voters, 12,000 communicants and 24,000 souls, but that seems very high.

[3] Deindoerfer, *Denkschrift zur Fuenfundzwanzigjaehrigen Jubelfeier der Ev. Luth. Synode von Iowa u. a. Staaten*, 16, contains the estimate of 15,000 communicants in 1879. Deindoerfer was usually reliable and he probably took the figure from recent statistics. The calculations are based on

Although the original constitution for congregations had been modified repeatedly, it reflected the earlier exclusiveness so strongly that it no longer served satisfactorily, particularly since it was also rather weak in regard to congregational organization. In 1864 the synod resolved that a new draft should be formulated. The execution of this resolution, however, was dragged out through the entire period. The convention of 1868 received a report that nothing had been done

---

the relations between the figures given for 1873. (Hereafter this Denkschrift will be cited as Denkschrift 25, and that of 1864 as Denkschrift 10.)

[4] Denkschrift 10, 17, 18.

[5] Denkschrift 25, 29-35.

and instructed S. Fritschel to work out a draft of a shorter and simpler constitution for the next convention.[6] This was done and the convention of 1869 resolved to send the draft for study to the conferences, who were to report to the following convention.[7] Apparently the draft was not altogether satisfactory, for Pastor Foelsch worked out a substitute draft.[8] The convention of 1873 had another draft, probably by Klindworth, before it, but postponed action to the next convention.[9] At length the convention of the Eastern District in 1876 discussed and approved a draft by Deindoerfer, asking him to draft a shorter version also. This constitution was not formally adopted but its publication in the *Kirchenblatt* to serve as an example was ordered.[10]

---

[6] K. B. XI, 23, 179. The secretary had requested that this resolution of 1864 be carried out. Zusammenstellung 1868 in I. S. D. also reports this resolution.

[7] K. B. XII, 24, 190. K. M., N. F., II, 1, 8.

[8] A letter, Foelsch - Grossmann, January 10, 1870, indicates that the Northern Iowa Conference had accepted this substitute. The writer has not been able to find a copy of either draft.

[9] K. B. XVI, 24, 188; Beschluesse 1873 in I. S. D. K. B. XVI, 20, 158, prints this draft and indicates that it was read by Klindworth. The convention of 1871 had been called early and was unable to give attention to all the business submitted, probably because the problem of educational finances occupied much of its time. The next convention in 1875 was specially called and preoccupied with schism and doctrinal controversy. Synodalbericht 1875 indicates no action.

This constitution consisted of forty-two paragraphs in ten sections, which in the condensed form was reduced to sixteen paragraphs without sections. Section I, identical in both forms provided for a name and based the congregation on Scriptures and the confessions and rejected indiscriminate altar fellowship. Section II provided for a ministry pledged to the confessions and in the long form regulated call procedure, rejecting vocations for limited terms, arbitrary dismissal or withdrawal, and prescribed procedure in case of complaints against the pastor. Section III dealt with the parochial school, which the long form required, with the pastor as teacher and with a parochial teacher as soon as means permitted, while the short form merely provided for

---

[10] *K. B.* XIX, 19, 151; 21, 160; XX, 2, 9. The president's report stated (p. 151) that the constitution should be disposed of. No changes were noted. The district adopted it as a recommendation to congregations. The report stated that adoption was not required by congregations, but that it was to serve as an example after some unhappy experiences. Adoption as it stood was held advisable. The Western District in 1877 also had a draft before it, which may have been the same one, but no action is recorded, *K. B.* XX, 15, 128. Discussion of this constitution had begun at the Eastern District convention of 1874, which adopted it in part, but found it too long for all purposes, it then having forty-five paragraphs. The short form was then suggested for the early stages of new congregations. When they were fully organized and had acquired property, the longer form should be adopted. It was remarked that this constitution had already been submitted to the general convention, probably in 1873, *K. B.* XXII, 14, 105-6.

Christian instruction. Section IV on membership, in both forms required confessional agreement, church attendance and Christian life and excluded members of secret societies. The short form merely required membership for altar fellowship, the long form in addition provided for reception after public announcement, with a period of probation if objections were raised; regulated instruction of non-Lutheran applicants; and forbade secret engagements and unscriptural marriages. Both forms required prompt baptisms and regular communions and pledged both parents and confirmed youth to attendance at Christenlehre, while the longer form cancelled membership for those remiss in this respect and obligated all members to share in congregational burdens. Section V provided for church discipline, the long form specifically providing for excommunication with ~~loss of~~ rights and offices and for readmission after repentance.

Section VI provided for a vestry, composed of devout and capable members who were to maintain order and concord, administer charity, maintain the property, be responsible for salaries and take charge of all business matters. The long form also provided for elections, established the offices of secretary and treasurer and provided for their duties and for vestry sessions. In Section VII regular biannual congregational meetings were established, with provisions for special meetings if properly called and announced, and the method of conducting them, under the chairmanship of the pastor, was prescribed. In addition the long form provided for preliminary discussions by the vestry and for elections of pastors, teachers and officers. The short form stopped at this point, the long one continued with Section VIII on property. The vestry was placed in charge of it with specified limitations. Members who had left or been excommunicated lost all property rights. In case of schism those members adhering to the confessions and this constitution were to keep the property. Provision was also made for trustees. Section IX accepted membership in the synod, which could be ended only by two-thirds majorities in two successive congregational meetings. Section X provided for amendments by the same procedure. This paragraph and those on the confessional position of pastor and congregation, procedure in case of complaints against the pastor, reception into and loss of membership, engagements and marriages and discipline were to be unalterable.[11]

---

[11] The longer form is printed, K. B. XX, 3, 17-19 and the short one, XXI, 10, 76-77. Klindworth's form of 1873 was somewhat shorter than the short form, but had all the essential provisions of the long form. It was much less specific, named no congregational officers, did not deal with order of services (the long form provided for the use of Loehe's Agende, though the congregation could change that) and retained a six week probation period for all applicants for membership, but did not provide for loss of membership in direct terms, if its requirements were not observed. Compared with the old congregational constitution, there may be noted: omission of the Richtung paragraph, of the detailed catechumenta provisions, of the permanent German language pledge, and of the requirement of public repentance after excommunication as a condition of readmission, as well as of the provisions for ordination, installation and visitation. On the positive side the constitution contained specific provisions for congregational vestries, officers and their duties, which had been lacking in the older version.

This constitution reflects both modification of original standards and determination to insist upon Christian living and to avoid any trend toward laxity. The old catechumenate was gone, a suggestion for a probationary period of six weeks in Klindworth's draft of 1873 is the only indication that it still received consideration. Few indications were found that it was still practiced, though it is quite possible that some of the congregations retaining the older constitution may have kept it in use. The newer practice as the proposed constitution indicated was consultation with the pastor and then public announcement and probation only if objections to membership were raised. Church discipline was maintained. Not only did the constitution provide for it, but the president stressed it repeatedly in addresses to synodical conventions and they and, no doubt, conferences as well discussed it on basis of papers submitted.[12] Instances of excommunication still occurred, but they were no longer common and the object of discipline was the deepening of spirituality in order to promote unofficial and brotherly discipline, rather than the sifting of the membership.[13]

---

[12] The presidential report or address of 1867 in I. S. D. strongly stresses discipline as a means of complying with the duty of raising the spiritual level in the congregations. That of 1869 warned against laxity in discipline, K. B. XII, 18, 141. A paper on discipline by Kroenke, presented at the Eastern District convention of 1877 was thoroughly discussed and every thesis covered was reformulated, K. B. XX, 16, 121-3.

[13] Deindoerfer, Denkschrift 25, 29-32. The convention of the Western District in 1876 found it advisable to remind pastors of the old rule that the president was to be notified,

In a provision in the longer form for the use of Loehe's Agende in all services and with all pastoral acts, unless the congregation formally decided otherwise, there is reflected a continuing emphasis in the true Neuendettelsau tradition on the dignity and beauty of the services. Again, however, there was no rigid insistence upon a prescribed form. The absence of serious conflicts on this point indicates that pastors were no longer intransigent in liturgical practices, while occasional notices indicate that they were concerned with creating a feeling for them in the congregations.[14] Another part of the Neuendettelsau heritage had been a strong emphasis on private confession. The new constitution did not mention it at all, but took public confession for granted when it required confessional announcements preceding communion. Occasional indications make it probable that pastors contented themselves with commending private confession and only rarely sought to introduce its regular use in their congregations.[15]

---

if discipline cases arose which were likely to lead to excommunication, K. B. XIX, 19, 108.

[14] E. g., Reck's Pastoralbericht Ascension Day 1874, reported the full liturgy in use. Vorbericht...Sherrill's Mount ...Kirchenvisitation, undated, mentioned that services were conducted according to Loehe's Agende. Both documents in I. S. D. Both the pastors were Neuendettelsau graduates. Visitation reports for the period are generally silent on the point, the form used does not seem to have inquired after liturgy. The Eastern District convention of 1876 heard and discussed a paper on liturgy by Kroenke, K. B. XIX, 22, 169-71.

[15] In K. B. XI, 83-4, Klindworth advocated use of private confession and gave suggestions for familiarizing

The new constitution maintained the older objections against secret societies and excluded from membership in the congregations members of such organizations which had demonstrably anti-christian principles. While this provision reflects a position which the synod maintained stoutly, there is evidence, that it was not in practice inflexibly and unconditionally applied and also that in some quarters objections were raised to concessions which were considered lax.[16] In

---

congregations with it. However in a *Visitationsbericht* for Klindworth's parish at Galena in I. S. D. which, though undated and unsigned, is written in Klindworth's hand and conforms to the pattern used during those years, private confession was not mentioned. Since no other such report of that period mentions it, the conclusion need not be that it was not used at Galena, but it may be that its use had become so uncommon that the visitation order did not inquire about it.

[16] S. Fritschel considered the position of the General Council on this question, which rejected the societies, but applied discipline rather than exclusion, as satisfactory if enforced. The synod had asked the Council to bear testimony against the societies but had not asked for exclusion of members as a *sine qua non*. He added that congregations who did not understand what was wrong in the societies would act sinfully, if they excluded their members outright, *K. B.* XII, 4, 25-29. The congregation at Mendota contained a large number of members of a secret society to which the synod objected (Odd Fellows), Klindworth, *Zeugniss*, 32-33; *K. B.* XII, 4, 25-29. Klindworth objected to their admission to communion by the local pastor and to the fact that the seminary rather than taking action on this point, held its own communion services. This would indicate that these members were not under discipline. The laxity was chargeable to the local pastor and the seminary was no doubt in a delicate position and its action was probably intended to apply pressure. Later the seminary organized its own congregation and invited the better local members to join it, which caused the pastor to resign from the synod. See a letter, Ade - Grossmann, Mendota, March 16, 1875, in I. S. D. For evidence on extreme and more moderate viewpoints on this question in the synod see Klindworth, *Traurige Zustaende*, 83, and *Bericht*...*Untersuchung*, 86. That Klindworth

some cases at least when congregations were received, in which members of secret societies held membership, these were treated by admonition rather than placed under discipline. It is likely that the exclusion provision was applied to members seeking admission, rather than to individuals who already held membership and the clause providing for objections and probations could serve in such cases.

This problem was normally much more acute in urban than in rural congregations, but the rise of the Granger movement created a rural problem also. The convention of 1873 was confronted with the problem of taking a stand on this organization. It resolved to warn the members of the synod against it on the ground that it was a secret oathbound organization, that its meetings had a religious character and that it represented epicurean and materialistic traits.[17] The Grangers were thus placed with other secret organizations

---

favored a stricter practice against secret societies is also clear from a letter, Deinzer ---, Neuendettelsau, August 26, 1875, in I. S. D.

[17] The problem arose in 1872 when an article on the subject was sent to the editor of the *Kirchenblatt*, Hoerlein, who cautiously refused to print it, because he did not know the facts. He referred to a warning issued by Missouri and noted reports of secret oaths and religious ceremonies, but asked for information, K. B. XV, 19, 151-2. The call to the convention of 1873 listed the question whether Grangers must be classed with Masons and other secret societies as an item of business, K. B. XVI, 11, 81. A committee of the convention answered that question affirmatively on the grounds given. It recommended that the *Kirchenblatt* warn rural members, all the more since they seemed also to stand in danger of being

on which the synod frowned and a number of warnings appeared in its organ, which elaborated the reasons given and also questioned the wisdom and utility of the economic and political program that appeared advantageous to many rural members.[18] In taking this stand the writers were consistent in applying the principles of the synod in regard to religious and confessional purity and social recreation. Unfortunately some of them also revealed lack of social consciousness in regard

---

victimized by unscrupulous politicians. The convention asked the seminary faculty to obtain information and proof and to publish it, but in the meantime pastors, who had had experiences which might serve as warning, were to publish them. As will be noted the Kirchenblatt carried several such articles, but none by the faculty, who may have reported to the conferences.

[18] Articles appeared K. B. XVI, 12, 13, 97-99; XVII, 11, 82-3; XVIII, 17, 129-30. The last recognized mixed motives for joining; economic and social advantages or a desire of Germans to mix with other people. Its chief argument was religious. The writer had observed a meeting of a Grange. He saw entering, open unbelievers, Jews, and members of several Christian churches including a few Lutherans. The meeting was opened with prayer. Such prayer was idolatry. The second acknowledged that sometimes a pledge could be substituted for an oath, but stressed the religious character of the ritual and materialism and also suggested that the leaders were cheating the members and that the program was impracticable. The tenor of the first may be gauged from the opening statement which was to the effect that secret societies had long estranged people, who might otherwise have been won for the church, so far mainly in the cities, but that now Beelzebub had gone out among the rural people. One of these articles was unsigned, the others were written by Bredow and Klindworth.

to the rural problem of their day and of an understanding of the political procedures of a democratic society or even of sympathy with them.[19] In spite of these warnings, the Granger movement became a source of friction in a number of congregations before its brief heyday had passed.[20]

The Granger episode indicated that the attitude which had frowned on all dancing still persisted. Both in printed warnings and in pastoral complaints the recreational aspects of the movement which included dances were deplored. The new constitution, no longer specifically mentioned dancing as conduct unbecoming to Christians or forbidden. However in 1877, a year after the constitution had been approved, the convention of the Eastern District dealing with the topic of discipline discussed dancing at length and concluded that since it involved close physical contacts between sexes and therefore temptations to vice, it must be held a sin and those who would not abstain must be excluded from communion, though not excommunicated.[21] This conclusion appeared in the Kirchenblatt and thus was communicated to the membership at large. There is evidence, that pastors in the west also shared this attitude and resorted to disciplinary measures against those who danced.[22]

---

[19] The movement believed that the evils attacked could be cured by social improvement, because they did not recognize sin as the cause. Untrustworthy politicians were misdirecting the movement to ineffective objectives. The cooperative features were a delusion.

[20] Letters, Hauser - Grossmann, McFarland, Wisconsin, May 8, 1874; Boden - Grossmann, Kellogg, Iowa, August 27, 1874; Hertel - Grossmann, Highland Center, Iowa, September 28, 1874; Dietz - Grossmann, St. Donatus, Iowa, November 10, 1874, and the document Vom Hoerensagen in I. S. D. indicate Granger troubles and the letters deal primarily with them. At Highland Center Grangers apparently were excommunicated. Chronik, 114, indicates that the period of difficulty was brief.

[21] K. B. XX, 16, 121-3. The first of the articles mentioned in footnote 18 and Hauser's letter had mentioned

Drinking was not a subject of serious controversy. Drunkenness was condemned as a vice by clergy and laity alike. Pastors sometimes had complaints to bring, because it was unusually common, and occasionally it appears to have been so common as to make discipline difficult.[23] Aside from such exceptional cases this question seems to have given no great trouble. In the seventies the rise of the temperance movement

---

dancing as objectionable features of the Granges.

[22] Hauser's letter noted dancing among other objections, noted that he had preached against joining the Grange, that some members had done so nevertheless, that some were leaving and others would, and asked for material for purposes of instruction. Dancing here was clearly incidental. Vom Hoerensagen indicates that pastor Kretzschmar in Freeborn had disciplined members for dancing and had lost most of his members on that account. A letter, Gass - Grossmann, Davenport, February 22, 1875, refers to girls who had attended a masquerade, some with their mothers and to an old lady who attended a theatre with her son. The vestry recognized such conduct as unbecoming, but feared losses if discipline were attempted. The pastor wished Grossmann to instruct the vestry directly. It is regrettable that Grossmann's reply is not extant. A letter, Gerlach - S. Fritschel, Waverly, December 20, 1875, describes how the pastor had to break up dancing at a church entertainment, where a specific pledge that there was to be no dancing had been given. The visitation reports have little information on this subject. Protokoll...Tete des Morts...Kirchenvisitation complains of dancing. All documents in I. S. D.

[23] A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, June 14, 1871, expresses doubts, whether there could be much future for the congregation he had just left, because drinking and worldly life were so rampant. His successor had just readmitted numbers of members who had been excluded or had left because of Deindoerfer's attitude.

raised the question of total abstinence. Several articles appeared in the Kirchenblatt which rejected this attitude. Temperance in the exact sense of the term was a Christian virtue, excessive drinking was sinful. But abstinence was not demanded by Scriptures and therefore moderate use lay within the sphere of Christian liberty. One of the writers, noting the connection between the temperance and the women's rights movement rejected the latter so far as political equality was concerned.[24] While an unchristian press was sometimes criticized when the synod concerned itself with Christian literature, no stand was taken against the press as a whole. In 1873, however, when a German newspaper, the Germania was founded and appealed to Protestants in general for support, the Kirchenblatt carried a warning that such an enterprise could only promote unionism. After the editor had replied that he had no intention of going into the doctrinal field, but merely wished to publish a political paper with a Christian slant, this warning was retracted and the paper recommended.[25]

---

[24] K. B. XV, 3, 20; 19, 148-9; 20, 154-5; XVII, 11, 81. The first was by Strobel, the second in two parts was signed G.. B. Deindoerfer wrote the third. It was he who criticized the women's rights movement in a second installment, 13, 101-2, maintaining that woman's place and most effective role was in the home. He objected to prayer by a mixed temperance group in the same vein as applied to secret societies.

[25] K. B. XVI, 8, 59-60. Klindworth wrote the warning and the editor endorsed it with some reservations, approving a general newspaper from a Christian point of view and expressing the wish that the Synodical Conference alone might direct the enterprise to the exclusion of other denominations. In 14, 188-9, more detailed criticism followed, while 16, 125-6,

During the first decade questions of practice concerning pastoral acts, such as funerals, baptisms, marriages had frequently come before conventions and general pastoral conferences and the policy had tended toward uniformity along exclusive lines. There is little record of such matters during this latter period, no doubt they were handled in pastoral conferences. In the one case which seems to have reached a convention, an inquiry whether non-Lutherans could serve as baptismal sponsors, the answer was not wholly negative, indicating that a trend toward more moderate practice already in evidence toward the end of the first decade was continuing.[26]

---

brought the editor's reply and endorsed the paper if the policies described were carried out. The paper was edited and controlled by members of Missouri and the Synodical Conference. Missouri repeatedly had denounced the worldly press and warned its members against reading daily papers. The writer recalls that the Germania was regularly read in later years in the Iowa parsonage in which he was reared.

[26] K. B. XIV, 23, 207, reports this case. A congregation had referred the question to the convention of 1871. The reply was to be given by the theological faculty. Discussion indicated that the parents were to be advised against the practice, since sponsors were not mere witnesses, but were to assume a responsibility for the Christian education of the child. If they could not see the point, the sponsor might be accepted as a witness only, if he were a decent Christian. Conference minutes are not extant, if they were still circulated, of which there is no evidence, they would tend to acquaint the ministry as a whole with local rulings and thus promote uniformity. The correspondence of the period raises few such questions, indicating that conferences handled them. A letter, Kessler - Grossmann, Westfield, July 21, --, in I. S. D., reports a burial in a neighboring Missouri congregation during the absence of its pastor. The pastor seems to have made the report in view of the possibility that trouble might arise, but does not seem to have anticipated it. Another letter, Hoerlein - Grossmann, March 6, 1865, Cottage Grove, in I. S. D., refers to a local rule forbidding interment of nonmembers on the congregational cemetery. A case which did not

A measure of interest was shown in the organization of societies within congregations, particularly women's groups. The Kirchenblatt reported organization of a number of ladies' aid societies, printed a constitution and recommended them as auxiliary organizations to promote not merely local, but also general causes. Statistical data, however, are lacking and it is probable that they were not as yet common in rural congregations.[27]

Visitations of congregations at periodic intervals were continued. The growth of the synod made it impossible for the president to conduct them personally and in connection

---

come to head, induced the pastor to seek abrogation of the rule by the congregation lest it hinder missionary efforts. He asked faculty advice on his position.

[27] K. B. XIII, 16, 124; 17, 133-4, brought a report on a ladies' aid society at Iowa City, the latter section giving the constitution as revised by the pastor. It had served purely local purposes, but he had broadened the aims and now recommended similar organizations to others, listing home and foreign missions, orphan and student aid as desirable causes for support. K. B. XIV, 15, 113-4, reported another at Wilton and 18, 138-40, a third at Cedar Falls with favorable comments and recommendations. The latter had used the Iowa City constitution as model and both stressed general purposes. K. B. XVI, 14, 112, reports inquiries and asks for information, so a report could be given on numbers, activities, receipts, etc. The report did not appear, however. The statistics for 1871 and 1872 in Chronik and the K. B. do not cover societies, indicating that the parochial report forms then in use had no rubric for them. It is probable that the society to aid the Toledo Orphanage in the east, which will be noted later, stimulated organization of local societies but no statistical data were available.

with constitutional changes to be discussed later, arrangements were made to provide for additional visitors. While the order used seems to have been flexible, visitors usually inquired into the relationship between pastor and congregation; services, regular and special and attendance, as well as frequency of communions and their use; spirituality in the homes and child training, use of Christian literature and synodical publications; conduct and discipline; salary and regularity in its payment; and sometimes into support of synodical causes. Visitation reports indicate that relations were usually harmonious. In cases where they were not investigations seem to have taken the place of visitations. In most congregations weekday and special services, such as Bible study periods were falling into disuse and only rarely were there Sunday evening services, although many still held Christenlehre in addition to the Sunday morning service or in the afternoon. In many parishes, services could be given only on alternate Sundays and some Filialen could be served only every three or four weeks. Reading services, conducted by laymen were used in such cases, but do not seem to have been successful. Reports on attendance, use of the sacrament, home altars, discipline varied considerably, but were not unfavorable in most instances. In most congregations synodical publications and other literature were read but little, but there were outstanding exceptions.[28]

---

[28] See visitations reports in I. S. D. There are less than twenty of them and most of them date from the sixties,

While the visitation reports indicate that the synod was continuing to stress religious instruction in Christenlehren on Sunday, the indications are that this institution was not operating in a satisfactory manner. Adults and confirmed youth were remiss in attendance. Pastors and visitors in various instances found it necessary to urge congregations to establish Christenlehre, sometimes with success, while sometimes no results were reported. There is no indication that there was a tendency to transform this institution into the modern Sunday School. In 1866 the Kirchenblatt carried a warning to members not to send their children to the Sunday Schools of sectarian churches, where they would be estranged from their own church.[29] The warning did not mention Christenlehren, but pointed out that parochials schools were

---

with a few in the early seventies. They seem to be fairly representative, with a few from nearly all areas and from large and small parishes, from good and unsatisfactory congregations. Obviously not nearly all reports are preserved. Reports to general and district conventions indicate that an effort was made to conduct regular visitations, but no statistics exist to indicate just how frequently they came. The existing reports do not indicate repeated visitations of the same congregations, although some had been reported as visited in the earlier period, but it is probable that many of them were visited again and no report preserved.

[29] K. B. IX, 11, 87. For the Christenlehren see the visitation reports. Particularly in rural areas it would no doubt have been extremely difficult at that time to enlist lay teachers for a Sunday School of the modern type. The Christenlehre was a Sunday School in which the pastor taught the group as one unit. It is still a major weakness in modern Sunday Schools, that it is difficult to attract and provide for the adult members.

a far more satisfactory means of providing religious instruction. Undoubtedly the continuing stress on the parochial school explains the comparative neglect of Sunday Schools. The complaints in regard to Christenlehren regularly concerned their neglect by confirmed youth and adults, rather than by children of school age. The convention of 1869 heard and discussed a paper on religious education, in which the Christenlehre was considered, in fact, entirely as a means of continuing religious instruction after confirmation.[30]

---

[30] K. B. XII, 21, 163-5. Grossmann presented a number of theses on parochial education of which No. 14 ran: It is not enough to bring Christian youth to the maturity required for confirmation, but care must be exercised that what has been gained is not lost again, by means suited to that end, the chief of which is a suitably organized and timed Christenlehre. Grossmann suggested placing the Christenlehre into the main service on Sunday morning. About twenty minutes were to be allowed for it. Either the socratic method or lectures might be used, but it must be made attractive. In this way the entire congregation might share in the blessing. He also suggested that the confirmed youth be required to occupy the front pews, so that attendance could be controlled. One of the rare mentions of the catechumenate occurs in this connection, in a suggestion that, where it existed, the catechumens needing instruction be required to sit directly behind the youth. The convention took the Christenlehre and its purpose for granted, but was not especially favorable to incorporation in the main service. It resolved that pastors place it wherever it promised to draw the best attendance and, while permitting inclusion, seemed to prefer the periods immediately preceding or following the service. If conducted in lecture form, inclusion might be suitable and in new congregations lectures might be preferable, since immature members usually dreaded questions and answers. A paper before the convention of the Eastern District in 1874 by Schmidt again stressed Christenlehren for confirmed youth. The convention preferred the Sunday afternoon period, but insisted that the Christenlehre, or at all events a Sunday School, where that had been substituted, must be held. It gave no idea how extensively Sunday Schools had been substituted,--possibly in a few city congregations in the east!

The provisions concerning parochial schools in the new congregational constitution reflect the continuing emphasis on this institution. Spiritual nurture of its youth was one of the cardinal principles of the synod. Since in its missionary endeavors it was so largely dealing with unchurched elements on a low spiritual level, it regarded a thorough Christian education of the youth as indispensably necessary to raise the level. Moreover it considered a lack of proper home discipline as one of the basic evils in American society. A Christian home atmosphere, seconded by Christian day schools, were requisite in order to develop emphasis upon Christian living as distinguished from mere profession which was one of its great objectives. If the present generation lacked the proper home background, it was the fundamental task of the parochial school to rear a spiritually minded generation which in the future might supply it.[31]

While there were occasional parishes indifferent to parochial schools, it was generally speaking possible to maintain them. Indifference on the part of individual parents who did not send children, or sent them irregularly, or sometimes alternated them between parochial and public schools drew much complaint.[32] To meet such difficulties the synod resorted to public and private representations, through articles in the Kirchenblatt and through efforts of individual pastors in their own congregations.[33] By resolution at least it also undertook to make the schools attractive, through methods of instruction calculated to attract and hold children; through inclusion of general subjects and of English in the

---

[31] An article *Von der Kinderzucht* by (Deindoerfer) in *K. B.* XIII, 14, 105-7; 21, 164-7, deals with home influences and their faults.

[32] The paucity of statistics again makes it difficult to present a clear picture. The theses presented to the convention of 1869, however, disposed of refusal to establish

---

parochial schools, by saying that this happened occasionally and went on to stress refusal to engage teachers and to provide suitable equipment as the chief shortcomings of congregations and finally criticized parental indifference, K. B. XII, 21, 163. The statistics for 1872 indicate that 2,236 children were enrolled plus 320 children of non-members, but it does not give the number of schools. The report covered seventy-four out of ninety-two parishes and of the seventy-four reports seven were blank in this rubric, probably indicating that in them no schools existed. Undoubtedly there were additional schools in the eighteen congregations which had not reported at all. That a school existed in a far-flung parish, did not, of course, indicate that instruction could be given in all its congregations, K. B. XVI, 24, 187-8.

[33] The convention of 1869 resolved that the essence of the discussions before it and the cause in general were to be publicized in the Kirchenblatt through a series of articles written by Grossmann, Lutz, Klindworth, Baumbach and Foelsch. K. B. XII, 21, 165. An article by Foelsch appeared, XIII, 4, 25-27, the others did not. Deindoerfer's article cited in footnote 31 and another by Schieferdecker, XIII, 24, 185-9, and XIV, 1, 1-2, were probably substitutes. Grossmann's thesis IX emphasized the duty of pastors to counteract parental indifference through personal persuasion. He warned against nagging or complaining and suggested that the pastor systematically visit negligent families, gather its members for a family devotion, examine the children, bestow praise or censure and then take the parents separately, ask their advice as to procedure and correct or admonish as needed. The convention approved this and suggested that pastors develop other methods of dealing with parents according to circumstances, XII, 21, 162 and 164.

curriculum to satisfy the demands of parents and compete with the public schools; and through the practice of charging tuition, on the theory that parents would appreciate instruction for which they had to pay more than that which was offered gratis and that they would have an incentive to assure regular attendance.[34] It was not easy to carry out these ideals as long as the burden of instruction rested almost entirely on overburdened pastors.[35] Nor was it easy to persuade congregations to engage parochial school teachers. In many cases the parish was unable to do so, in others the members had come to look upon teaching as one of the normal functions of curriculum to satisfy the demands of parents and compete with the public schools; and through the practice of charging tuition, on the theory that parents would appreciate instruction for which they had to pay more than that which was offered gratis and that they would have an incentive to assure regular attendance.[34] It was not easy to carry out these ideals as long as the burden of instruction rested almost entirely on overburdened pastors.[35] Nor was it easy to persuade congregations to engage parochial school teachers. In many cases the parish was unable to do so, in others the members had come to look upon teaching as one of the normal functions of their pastor or they lacked sufficient educational consciousness to be greatly interested in an efficient parochial school or they preferred to use the public schools for general education with such provisions for religious instruction as their pastor might be able to make.[36] Even when congregations could be induced to employ teachers, it was difficult to find applicants who were both good teachers and Christian characters in conformity with the synod's ideals, and willing also to accept the meager salaries offered.[37]

---

[34] Ibid., 163. Grossmann recommended such procedures, stressing the teaching of English as the best means to meet competition from public schools. He also advocated examinations every three months, to expose consequences of irregular attendance, and generous vacations in seasons of hard work, when parents needed their children. The convention approved tuition and declared the other suggestions salutary methods and asked pastors to introduce them so far as feasible, pp. 164-5. Visitation of schools, examinations, and also school festivals had already been ordered in 1867, Zusammenstellung 1867 in I. S. D. They do not appear to have been developed highly during this period. In 1877 the Western District resolved at the president's suggestion that the visitors meet during conventions to consider improvement in schools, especially better books, and report, K. B. XX, 21, 162; 22, 170.

[35] Some years later an article in K. B. XVIII, 16, 123-5, pointed out that while parents were often to blame, pastors must share the blame if they failed to make school attractive. A stern attitude would alienate children; parents demanded results; school should not be dropped unnecessarily. While it might be true that pastors were not primarily teachers, they were responsible for their youth.

---

[34] Ibid., 163. Grossmann recommended such procedures, stressing the teaching of English as the best means to meet competition from public schools. He also advocated examinations every three months, to expose consequences of irregular attendance, and generous vacations in seasons of hard work, when parents needed their children. The convention approved tuition and declared the other suggestions salutary methods and asked pastors to introduce them so far as feasible, pp. 164-5. Visitation of schools, examinations, and also school festivals had already been ordered in 1867, Zusammenstellung 1867 in I. S. D. They do not appear to have been developed highly during this period. In 1877 the Western District resolved at the president's suggestion that the visitors meet during conventions to consider improvement in schools, especially better books, and report, K. B. XX, 21, 162; 22, 170.

[35] Some years later an article in K. B. XVIII, 16, 123-5, pointed out that while parents were often to blame, pastors must share the blame if they failed to make school attractive. A stern attitude would alienate children; parents demanded results; school should not be dropped unnecessarily. While it might be true that pastors were not primarily teachers, they were responsible for their youth.

This led to projects for training teachers which recurred throughout the period and which have already been discussed. The establishment of the teachers' seminary came too late, however, to affect this period, for its first class was still in school in 1879. The fact of its foundation, however, indicated clearly a continuing emphasis on parochial schools and some degree of success in the endeavor to get congregations to engage teachers. In the meantime the pastors, with few exceptions, carried their teaching burden. Without special training for teaching many found the task doubly difficult. Notice has been taken of the introduction into the seminary of catechetical work, designed to give at least a measure of training, for a task which for some time, at least, would be an almost universal duty.[38] Neuendettelsau also was asked to give such training and instruction in English as well to its graduates, and made at least some efforts in that direction.[39] Even with some training, the pastors found the work difficult and demanding, and there were those who attributed premature deaths among the clergy to the unending strain of teaching duties. Others complained that teaching took up so much time that no leisure for study and self-improvement remained.[40] But though there were complaints, the burden was borne and the emphasis on parochial schools was maintained throughout the period.

---

[36] Even the fine old congregation at St. Sebald which had formerly maintained a teacher, requested the synod to relieve Grossmann of the presidency in 1867, so that he could teach. The synod ordered a reply written which was to reject erroneous notions on the part of congregations about the duty of pastors to teach and asserted that larger congregations were in duty bound to engage teachers. It offered, however, to appropriate $150 toward a teacher's salary at St. Sebald. Zusammenstellung 1867 in I. S. D. The articles by Foelsch and Schieferdecker cited in footnote 33 both criticized the public school for its lack of religious education and advocated parochial schools in contrast, the latter also objected to alternate attendance of both.

[37] The correspondence in the I. S. D. indicates that requests for teachers increased through the period, but that it was hard to hold good men and that there were difficulties with unsatisfactory personalities. Several of Deindoerfer's letters from Toledo have such indications. What was asked is best illustrated in a letter, Strobel - Grossmann, Wilton, February 7, 1875. Reporting that a teacher was sought, it was specified that a professional teacher, who looked upon teaching as his lifework and who was capable of teaching both in German and in English and who was a sound confessional Lutheran was required. Both his ability and his viewpoint should be proved, but he should not be a man who intended to enter the ministry eventually. At the beginning he must be satisfied with the minimum necessary for existence.

---

[38] It was the convention of 1869 which gave such thorough consideration to the whole problem, which made this provision and with a preamble which stated that pastors would have to teach for some time to come. It may be noted that a second resolution provided for the admonition of congregations which refused to establish schools and for their dismissal from synod, if the admonition went unheeded, K. B. XII, 21, 164.

[39] Ibid. Grossmann was instructed to ask Neuendettelsau also to give catechetical instruction. An undated and unsigned draft in I. S. D. replying to Bauer's address to the convention of 1871 mentions the point. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, August 10, 1873, remarked rather strongly that the synod must insist that Neuendettelsau take English instruction seriously. Deindoerfer had a position to fill which required teaching in English and apparently a German candidate who could not fill it. Somewhat later during the crisis of 1875, a letter, Deindoerfer - Deinzer, Defiance, June 16, 1875, asked that more attention be given to training in English and common school subjects such as arithmetic and U. S. geography, since practically all pastors had to teach and German candidates despite earlier requests were almost uni-

---

formly deficient in this respect. The reply, Deinzer - Deindoerfer, August 26, 1875, was hardly enthusiastic. English was given, but not more than reading knowledge was practicable, pastors who could preach in English would have to be trained in America. Some instruction in history and geography of the United States could be added, would Deindoerfer recommend a text in German. As to catechetical instruction, what was the seminary doing in this respect? The coordinated course could not in any case stand much addition. He also inquired whether the seminary neglected Greek altogether and wrote that he would not sacrifice Latin for English. In turn the reply, Deindoerfer - Deinzer, undated, but marked December 1875, merely affirmed that pastors learned Greek and regretted inability to give German texts as requested, since English texts were in use. In a later letter, Deinzer - S. Fritschel, June 26, 1878, Deinzer again maintained that ability to speak English could not be achieved there and in another, Deinzer - Deindoerfer, October 5, 1878, stated that he did not know how to give catechetical training. All letters are in I. S. D., the two by Deindoerfer a copy and a draft.

[40] Again Deindoerfer's letters from Toledo have many such indications. Deindoerfer felt that his congregation could maintain a teacher, but it refused and when he had one, he had to pay him out of his own pocket. The most graphic description the writer has seen is in a letter from an unnamed correspondent, printed K. M., N. F. I, 6, 41-45; 7, 51-3. The writer taught school all week with an enrollment of twenty to one hundred children. Calls for pastoral acts often interrupted school or after school hours demanded long wearisome journeys. He had little time to prepare for Sundays and on that day served several charges, returning late and exhausted. But on Monday morning school began again. Sometimes school was dismissed for a day in favor of a missionary journey. An exhausting day of calls, pastoral acts and services amidst handicaps would follow and it might take all night to return. But the next morning there was school. The description gave

The introduction of English instruction in the schools did not indicate a general trend toward pastoral work in English. While bi-lingual pastors may occasionally have given English services, there is no record of an English parish or even of regular English services within a parish during the period. If English became prominent in schools, it was because parents who wished their children to learn English would send them to public schools, if the parochial school did not serve this need. For the same reason it was necessary to introduce common elementary school subjects and for some of them texts could not be obtained in German. This very fact, however, led the synod to realize that English would eventually become dominant. The experience of older Lutheran groups in the east pointed in the same direction. There was indeed an occasional dissenting voice, which saw indications that German was growing stronger rather than weaker and which proclaimed that the future of confessional Lutheranism in America lay with the German elements.[41] Neuendettelsau,

---

a general picture, however, and did not entirely reflect personal experiences. The president's report in 1868 mentioned several cases of illness among pastors, some resulting in withdrawal, at least temporarily, K. B. XI, 21, 162, and Chronik, 87, remarked in this connection that the consequences of heavy loads of teaching and preaching were beginning to show.

[41] K. M., N. F. III, 4, 25-28, brings a statement to this effect by Klindworth. He used to think that German would die out in America, but not any more. Local evidences of persistence in Galena, similar experiences elsewhere, the strength of the religious as well as secular German press in America, statements by political leaders, all helped to change his mind. Large Lutheran synods in the west were an important factor also. English Lutheran churches tended to

faced with a difficult problem in training its students in English, also tended to cling to a belief in the future of German in America.[42] Despite such influences, the leadership of the synod had by the end of the period accepted the necessity of bi-lingual training for its pastors. They needed English for their schools and for ready intercourse with their environment. They might not yet need it for pastoral work among their people, but that time too would come and it was best to prepare for it. Unenthusiastically, to be sure, they accepted the fact that future generations would speak English. The church which could not follow this change, would lose its future.[43] Though this point of view did not mean, that the

---

lose their Lutheranism, the future lay with the German churches. He did, however, acknowledge that English was needed also, even in the church, and its institutions must teach both languages, though they were unable to give equal weight to both.

[42] K. M., N. F. II, 6, 41-44, gave Loehe and German immigration credit for strengthening German in America. The belief was expressed, however, that in the end English would dominate, but German would persist in educated circles. But 7, 53-55, brought a number of testimonials of German survival under favorable circumstances without expressing a conclusion. The influence of nationalism fostered by German unification is seen in another article, 9, 65-74, which gave to mission work credit for promoting the German church, German language, customs and education in America and preserving ties between emigrants and the homeland. The letter, Deinzer - Deindoerfer, August 26, 1875, in I. S. D., mildly opposed Deindoerfer's view of the eventual predominance of English and suggested that German needed to be stressed and maintained.

[43] Deindoerfer expressed this viewpoint in his letter, Deindoerfer - Deinzer, Defiance, June 16, 1875. Copy in I. S. D.

synod was contemplating going over into English work more rapidly or extensively than circumstances dictated, it was nevertheless a departure from its original position. The change is clearly reflected in the omission from the new constitution for congregations of the old paragraph which asserted the purpose to be and to remain German.[44]

All vocations of pastors and pastoral changes were to be handled by the president under the synodical constitution of 1864. In practice this occasionally at least was not strictly observed. The convention of 1868 found it necessary to resolve that pastors should not make suggestions for filling vacancies and congregations should not issue vocations without knowledge and consent of the president.[45] As the synod grew and spread over a wider area and the establishment of districts within the synod became a necessity, provisional arrangements on this point were made, which culminated in the entire transfer of this function to district presidents in the new synodical constitution provisionally adopted in 1873.[46] Even then there was still complaint of irregularities.[47] Pastoral changes occurred so frequently, that the president repeatedly deplored this tendency. He seems to have blamed the pastors, for he had a paper on pastoral vocations submitted to the convention of 1868 with express reference to the number of changes. There was, however, no great change, obviously the causes of the frequent changes must be sought in unsatisfactory conditions in many parishes.[48]

---

[44] It may also be noted that the synod projected a pamphlet in 1871 for dissemination among prospective emigrants in Germany. All pastors were asked to give their exact location, the German regional origin of their people, and details about the work done in church and school. Urban pastors were to report on industries and pay scales as well as farming in the vicinity. Rural pastors were asked to discuss availability of land, fertility, price, climate, distance to market. This may have been a response to Vilmar's suggestion on this point, but if the pamphlet was published, the writer was not able to find a copy, K. B. XV, 22, 174-5.

[45] K. B. XI, 23, 179, Zusammenstellung 1868 in I. S. D. The procedure of the old congregational constitution was to be followed. Grossmann's burdens and his inaccessibility at St. Sebald probably caused a tendency toward irregularity, which had developed during the first decade, to persist.

---

[46] This point need be only mentioned here, it may receive fuller attention in the chapter on constitutional development. The new synodical constitution can most conveniently be found in Deindoerfer Geschichte, 170-175.

[47] A letter, Hoerlein - Grossmann, Iowa City, September 12, 1873, in I. S. D. reports several irregular changes in the Southern Iowa Conference. The new constitution had only just been adopted and the new system was undoubtedly not yet in smooth operation, but Hoerlein referred to willful insubordination and apparently partially blamed the officer in charge. See also a letter, Strobel - Grossmann, Wilton, September 12, 1873, in I. S. D.

[48] Grossmann reported seventeen changes of place in 1868 in little more than a year and remarked that this was too many and he had asked S. Fritschel to prepare theses on vocation which the convention should consider thoroughly, K. B. XI, 21, 161. Chronik reported that the convention had agreed that there were too many changes, p. 87, and noted that Grossmann had reprimanded the synod on this account and because changes had occurred irregularly. Only one of the theses could be discussed, p. 89. In connection with the next convention Chronik, 91, reported that only four changes had

The provisions of the congregational constitution on calls and tenure of pastors represent a synodical policy which had been maintained from the beginning. It seems gradually to have been accepted, although there is an occasional instance of a congregation engaging pastors by the year.[49] Investigations of difficulties between pastors and congregations occurred, but not often, the frequency of changes probably prevented many such situations from arising. The constitutional provisions in regard to salary also represent a synodical policy adopted at an earlier time and apparently put into fairly common practice. They provided an annual fixed and adequate salary which was to be paid regularly.

---

occurred. In 1871 the president again reported seventeen changes and placed S. Fritschel's theses on the agenda with the remark that there was evidence that their discussion was needed, K. B. XIV, 14, 106. The convention, however, had time for only a brief discussion and ordered the theses sent to the conferences for discussion and then referred back to the next synod, 21, 162. Expanded into a paper the theses appeared, Theologische Monatshefte, II, 2, 41-51; 3, 81-95; 4, 111-19; 5, 141-50. The convention of 1873 again postponed discussion, K. B. XVI, 24, 188. The conferences probably studied the paper, but there is no evidence that a synodical convention did. A study of the attitudes of pastors on calls received was on the agenda of the convention of the Western District in 1877, K. B. XX, 15, 121. The problem continued, for Deindoerfer reported to the convention of the Eastern District in 1876 that there were too many changes, K. B. XIX, 19, 150.

[49] Letters, Dunsing - Grossmann, Metropolis, (Illinois), January 7; January 30, 1866, report an instance of a call by the year. They also indicate a confessionally questionable congregation. Another letter, Reinsch - Grossmann, Metropolis, May 5, 1866, endorses a proposal to combine the two congregations in that vicinity into one parish and remarks that if some of the people left in protest that would mean only a wholesome cleansing. Proposed to save manpower, the combination was not permanently effected. All letters in I. S. D.

Beyond publication of resolutions of the convention of 1864 in the *Kirchenblatt* the synodical records do not reveal further official action on salaries during the period.[50] Some complaints on inadequacy occurred, and the general level was never high, but there seems to have been considerable improvement in this respect.[51]

Management of congregational affairs was vested in the hands of elected vestries, whose members held congregational offices, while control rested in congregational meetings, presided over by the pastor. This pattern too had evolved in the earlier period and was merely accepted by the new constitution. Complaints of poor attendance at congregational meetings were rather common and occasionally there were charges of disorderly behavior. Resolutions sometimes were poorly phrased and there were difficulties in regard to enforcement. On the whole, though, such complaints were few and congregational affairs seem generally to have been reasonably well administered.[52] As congregations grew, many of them were able to build churches and parsonages, generally frame structures, but rather imposing stone or brick churches arose in some larger urban congregations like Dubuque.[53] The synod frowned upon fairs and entertainments as means of raising funds for such projects, but they occurred occasionally.[54]

---

[50] The notice appeared *K. B.* VIII, 1, 4-5. The regulations had suggested minima of $250 and $300 for rural and urban congregations and fixation in the call. No resolution fixing higher levels was found.

[51] Early in the period, a letter, Hoerlein - Grossmann, Cottage Grove, January 17, 1865, reported a salary of $200, farming gave a total income of $300. Living costs produced a deficit of $36 for the last year. A year later, another letter, Hoerlein - Grossmann, Cottage Grove, February 12, 1866, gave no amounts, but said the congregation could easily pay $500, but would not. Still a year later a letter, Ledebur - Grossmann, Martinsburg (Iowa), September 22, 1867, asked that the writer be called away, because his people, who could affort it, would not give him income adequate for his needs, let alone for buying a badly needed horse. Here the call had not fixed a level. In the seventies, a letter, Matter - --, Des Moines, April 3, 1872, referred to a congregation which would sign only $150 and suggested withholding the call until it was raised to $250. The visitation reports contain some complaints, but most pastors seemed satisfied in regard to regularity and raised no complaints about amount. *Visitations Bericht*, Cairo, October 4, 1872, reported a salary of $400 inadequate there, but a letter, Helbig - Grossmann, Cairo, December 3, 1872, reported an increase to $500. Late in the period, a letter, Boden - Grossmann, Kellogg (Iowa), May 3, 1875, complained that young pastors threatened to leave their charges unless they were paid $400-$500. All documents in I. S. D.

---

[52] Individual complaints can be found in letters and visitation reports in I. S. D. The subject is generally discussed, K. B. XVII, 1, 2-4.

[53] Dedications were usually reported in the Kirchenblatt and Chronik from 1869 carried a listing of them. There were parishes, however, which still had to get along with makeshift meeting places in schools and homes.

[54] A fair was held to raise funds for the church in Dubuque. The Gemeindeblatt of the Wisconsin Synod in an article not available to the author charged that a lottery, a popularity contest for pastors and other unseemly features had occurred. K. B. XXII, 7, 52-3, the fair was admitted. It was argued that the unseemly features had been exaggerated for ulterior purposes. The synod, however, deplored the occurrence of the affair. Shortly afterward the K. B. reprinted two articles from other sources strongly condemning such practices, 15, 116-7. Missouri attacked the Iowa presentation, Lutheraner, XXXV, 8, 62-3. See also fragments of a letter, Luz - --, Dubuque, March 29, 1879, in I. S. D. The affair in Waverly, noted previously, which ended in dancing, was another instance of the kind. Several pastors in the vicinity who had been invited refused to attend. The pastor in this instance was soon called away, but his breaking up of the dancing had occasioned trouble. Letters, Gerlach - S. Fritschel, Waverly, December 20, 1875; January 6, 1875(6),

Appeals to other congregations to assist in building churches were made only rarely and under special circumstances in this period.[55]

During the sixties the synod made an effort to have all congregations served by its pastors join the synod. The convention of 1867 required both synodical and non-synodical congregations to support synodical causes and to receive visitation. An article suggesting membership through application to the president was to appear in the Kirchenblatt.[56] It was specified that the constitution of the congregation must be in agreement with the congregational constitution of the synod. Perhaps this was a stumbling block for the convention of 1868 asked only that congregations, having their own constitution, send in copies with their applications.

M. Koeberle - S. Fritschel, Waverly, January 11, 1876, in I. S. D., deal with this affair and its consequences.

[55] The case of Atlanta, Georgia, has been mentioned in the preceding chapter. A letter, Reinsch - Grossmann, Paducah, January 8, 1867, in I. S. D., reported that incendiarism had destroyed the church. He asked for an appeal through the Kirchenblatt to replace his gown which had also been destroyed. No appeal appeared, but in a second letter, Ibid., February 8, 1867, he acknowledged gifts and asked an appeal for assistance to rebuild the church. Again no appeal appeared, but Grossmann may have secured some aid as in the former case.

[56] Zusammenstellung 1867 in I. S. D. The article did not appear immediately, but the next synod reassigned it.

That body also requested each pastor to make an endeavor to get his congregation, if unaffiliated, to join within two years, unless he had reasons for not doing so. The decision to join was to be made in a regular congregational meeting, recorded in the minutes and followed by an application to the president.[57] Available statistics indicate that at least a third of the congregations did not join and that membership did not keep step with expansion.[58] The chief advantage to congregations was the right to attend synodical meetings and that right was not highly prized during the period. Some congregations seem simply to have preferred an independent status and others had fears of compromising their property and of being subjected to synodical domination.[59]

---

[57] K. B. XI, 23, 177. Pastors were to give reasons if they did not urge their congregations to join and also to report the reasons of congregations which refused. The secretary was to keep a list of congregations holding membership. The procedure does not always seem to have been followed. The congregation at Wilton sent delegates to conventions on the strength of an application by its pastor and passed no resolution of its own. After the upheaval of 1875 the question of its membership was to figure in legal proceedings. See statement signed Gottfr. Fritschel, Mendota, November 12, 1876, and a letter, Gass - --, Davenport, September 25, 1877, in I. S. D.

[58] K. B. XVI, 24, 187, gave a total of 143 congregations in seventy-four parishes reporting, of whom ninety-two held membership, while fifty-one did not. K. B. XX, 14, 105, indicated that in the Eastern District there were fifty congregations of whom twenty-nine to thirty-one held membership. Presidential reports to conventions usually named the congregations which had joined during the period since the last convention, the number was regularly smaller than the indicated growth of the synod.

[59] Articles on this topic appeared K. B. XI, 24, 185-7; XII, 6, 41-43 (the articles assigned by the convention of 1867);

Although thus a considerable number of congregations did not become members of the synod, they shared with synodical congregations the obligation to support its enterprises. The educational institutions were the chief enterprise after the Indian mission had to be abandoned early in the period. Some gifts for missionary purposes came in on occasion and were sent to some Lutheran missionary organization, but the Synod had not assumed obligations to support such causes and did not make organized efforts to raise funds for them. It did endorse an emigrant mission established by the Pennsylvania Synod in New York and commended this cause to its membership, but here also no organized endeavor to raise funds was instituted.[60] The institution of mission festivals has been noted

---

XIII, 19, 150-2 and 21, 153-6. Their statements furnish the reasons given for refusal to join. Their chief argument in favor was supply with pastors, which however, was also given non-members. Congregational representation at conventions will be treated in another chapter, here it may be noted that the synod earnestly desired it. Protocoll...1871... Elkport Kirchenvisitation in I. S. D. gives a case where a congregation expressed fears that its property belonged to the synod. The visitors reassured it by reference to its deed.

[60] The emigrant mission was referred to as the Castle Garden Mission. Its object was to protect immigrants against unscrupulous exploitation and to give material and spiritual aid. The older pastors knew the evils involved from personal experience. Grossmann recommended support at the convention of 1867, President's Report 1867 in I. S. D., and the convention authorized publication of an appeal in the Kirchenblatt, Zusammenstellung 1867, The appeal was not repeated, some support seems to have been given thereafter. In 1879 Pastor G. Fritschel, son of S. Fritschel, became an assistant at the mission, Chronik, 159.

elsewhere, but the offerings, though originally intended for missions, were soon designated for educational purposes.[61] The orphanages were not synodical enterprises, but in 1867 an annual offering for them on the thirteenth Sunday after Trinity was made a synodical regulation.[62] Some funds were also raised for the support of the widows of pastors through offerings.[63] Finally there was the synodical treasury for which an annual offering was to be raised on Reformation Day.[64]

The congregations thus were asked to raise the older regular offerings for the educational institutions on the three great festival Sundays, and on the Harvest Home Festival Day, the annual offering for orphans in the middle and that for the synodical treasury near the end of the non-festival half of the church year. Besides this there were mission festivals and for a good part of the period the special every-member appeals for education. Offerings for pastor's widows were at first specially ordered after deaths and later were to be an annual institution raised between the Christmas and the Easter offerings. At various times offerings for *Reiseprediger* treasuries were to be raised on private occasions, but not in regular services.[65] While the special appeals as a regular institution were never very successful and were dropped after 1875, another appeal was ordered as a jubilee occasion in 1879 to extinguish synodical debts.[66]

---

[61] Zusammenstellung 1868 in I. S. D. has the provision for mission festivals. According to Chronik, 95, the mission festivals were made annual affairs and designated for education in 1871. In 1868 they had been designated for home and foreign missions. The first record of such an occasion that has come to the writer's notice is in a letter, Hoerlein - Grossmann, Elkport, October 16, 1868. The Kirchenblatt carried notices of them in later years. Indications are that the funds raised went to education, though it is possible that some pastors may have designated them for mission purposes. In the next period they were to become the great source of mission funds.

[62] **Chronik**, 89. In the east the offerings were to go to Toledo, in the west to Andrew.

[63] This subject will be treated and documented in a later chapter.

[64] This was reaffirmed in 1867, Zusammenstellung 1867. Originally either Reformation Day or the Harvest Home Festival Day was designated.

---

[65] In the first period the first Sunday in Lent had also been designated for an offering and Harvest Home Festival Day was an alternate occasion. The Eastern District resolved in 1878 to make the first Sunday in Lent an annual penitential day and establish the Harvest Home Festival on the first Sunday in October, *K*. *B*. XXI, 16, 127. The convention of 1879 adopted the first of these for the synod, XXIII, 15, 116. Since many congregations used Thanksgiving Day for the Harvest Home Festival, which the Eastern District rejected, the synod did not fix this day, *Chronik*, 155. The latter was now regularly designated as an offering day for educational institutions, the former does not then appear to have been a regular offering date, but perhaps the offering for pastor's widows was then raised in some congregations.

[66] This offering was announced *K*. *B*. XXII, 3, 17-18. Both districts had provided for it, the *Ausschuss* was to announce it and did, XX, 22, 170; XXI, 16, 125-6.

As has been noted in connection with the problems of the educational institutions, it was difficult to enforce this series of offerings. Over against the first ten years there was a considerable increase in receipts, but it did not suffice to meet the needs. Both educational institutions and the Synodical Treasury were in debt as the period ended. The results of the special jubilee appeal were disappointing.[67] So far as the membership was concerned the adverse factors operative during the first decade were still hindrances. Though there was considerable growth it should also be remembered that the years of greatest expansion were a period of hard times. The synod seemed to feel that pastors also were often remiss in raising offerings and made attempts to correct this.[68] It may be said that at the end of the period the outlook was brightening. The income of the educational institutions had risen above $5,000 and debts were diminishing rather than increasing. Considerable sums too were raised for other purposes.[69] With the advent of better times and with expansion continuing at an accelerated rate, the future bade fair to bring a better financial showing.

---

[67] *K*. *B*. XXIII, 1, 1, said so in so many words. This may have been intended to stimulate efforts to raise more, although the offering was to be raised during 1879. In 16, 123, the total received up to then was given as $3,019, which was slightly less that the seminary debt alone. The debt of the synodical treasury had been given as $1,750 in 1873, *K*. *B*. XVI, 24, 188, and in 1875 the debt seems to have remained almost unchanged, since income and expenses approximately balanced and only $252.69 had been paid for interest and debt retirement. No account for 1879 was found, but a document in I. S. D. *Die Kapitalschulden der Synodal casse betreffend*, gives the debt as $1,319 on January 1, 1880, and notes reduction to about $584 during that year, presumably from the 1879 appeal funds. *Synodalbericht 1882*, 29, reports the total raised through the 1879 appeal as $3,449.15 and payment of $933.92 on the debt of the *Synodalkasse*, as well as extinction of the Galena debt of $2,032.71. The book store received $310.25 for losses incurred in handling synodical publications, but only $86.75 were paid on the seminary debt.

---

[68] An article by Strobel, K. B. XIV, 17, 132-3, written on behalf of the special committee which in 1872 looked into institutional finances stated directly that the difficulties would dissolve if all pastors would raise all offerings in all congregations. In future a common treasurer should handle the funds, so that those who did not raise offerings could be detected and admonished. The convention of 1873 named committees for both east and west who were to call pastors not doing their duty to account. In 1877 at the convention of the Western District, the list of derelict congregations was read and the pastors called to account. Such reasons as poverty or church building were not accepted, but attention was called to a regulation that pastors who felt it necessary to drop offerings must obtain the approval of the president. Similar inquiries were to be made of absent pastors and for new members the offering dates were to be printed and distributed, K. B. XX, 22, 170-1. It may also be noted that Hoerlein, commenting on the statistics of 1871, had pointed out vast differences between congregations in per capita contributions and had contended that with appropriate efforts the general average could be raised from $1.50-$2.00 up to $10, K. B. XV, 12, 44-45. This rather extravagant goal met criticism, 14, 110. Resolutions providing publicity for offerings and directing that pastors remiss in raising them should be named at conventions had been adopted in 1869, K. B. XII, 24, 189-90.

[69] Chronik, 156, gives the figures for 1879 and preceding years and lists the seminary debt as $3,256.10. The income figures, however, combined all sources, the congregations had raised a little more than $3,000, K. B. XXII, 21, 167. Figures for other causes in 1879 were not found; in 1872 $1,003.30 was raised for orphans, $690.92 for the synodical treasury. Contributions of $122.81 for foreign missions were also listed, K. B. XVI, 24, 187-8.

The synod professed high ideals of Christian living. It was dealing with people, who in many cases had long been unchurched and spiritually neglected. It was not under the circumstances possible to realize the ideals with any degree of perfection. Individual pastors varied in zeal and consecration. The leadership of the synod was consistent in its efforts to strive toward greater perfection and to uphold the ideals. There is much to indicate that by and large the pastors did likewise. If results were slow in manifesting themselves, particularly in support for synodical causes, there is evidence that in other respects, particularly in the maintenance of parochial schools, there was a measure of improvement.

CHAPTER XV

FUNCTIONS: SYNODICAL UNDERTAKINGS 1864-1879

The printery at the seminary became inadequate in the late sixties. Rather extensive improvements were made on borrowed capital. When the debt burden became heavy a plan was submitted to the convention of 1867 for the formation of a corporation. The membership was to be asked to subscribe for shares, which would not pay interest and which would become payable in three or four years, preferably in literature and subscriptions.[1] The project thus was an appeal to synodical patriotism, rather than an opportunity for investment. The convention adopted it, but it does not appear to have been pushed with vigor and in consequence it did not succeed.[2]

---

[1] The plan was presented and an appeal on behalf of it made in a supplement to K. B. XI, 16. Since a larger press was needed, $1,000 had already been borrowed at 10 per cent. Value of the shares was $5, shareholders taking repayment in synodical publications were entitled to a discount of 10 per cent. Payment in instalments was acceptable. It will be remembered that the convention of 1864 had already authorized enlargement of the printery.

[2] Zusammenstellung 1867 in I. S. D. brings the resolution which left the management to the seminary. The copy marked as to enforcement indicates that the plan had been discussed in the Galena Conference. Possibly it was submitted to others also. The notice in the Kirchenblatt given in footnote 1 is the only attempt to publicize the plan that has been found and it appeared a year later. It is not clear why more vigor was not shown, perhaps the reception was generally apathetic. Acknowledgements in K. B. XI, 20, 162; XII, 7, 12 and 18, indicate that fifteen shares were taken by seven pastors and six laymen of whom two each took two. The first source also acknowledged gifts totalling $6.

It would seem that it became impossible to make the needed improvements, for in 1870 the printery was closed.[3] The Kirchenblatt was printed by a number of commercial printers for some years thereafter, not always with satisfactory results.[4] There were those who deplored the abandonment of the printery and the convention of 1871 resolved that it was to be reopened at Iowa City, but this resolution was never carried out.[5] At length in 1878 a new printery was established at Defiance, Ohio. A contract was made under which space and use of presses was leased from a printing firm. The printery acquired other needed equipment, but only for printing periodicals, not for books. Deindoerfer's son, became manager and his father assumed responsibility.[6] A board to supervise the establishment was created at the convention of 1879.

---

[3] Chronik, 94, reports the bare fact, but gives no explanation. Probably the debt burden was too heavy to permit further borrowing for necessary equipment. The debt seems to have been assumed by the Kirchenblatt treasury, which later showed a considerable debt. Zusammenstellung 1868 in I. S. D. indicates that the convention of that year had named a committee to investigate the printery and to consider relocation and employment of a professional typesetter. Perhaps this committee recommended abandonment for reasons of lack of expert labor at the seminary. The printery equipment was sold later for $164.20, Chronik, 124, less $24.60 for freight, K. B. XVIII, 20, 159, probably when the seminary was removed to Mendota.

[4] The printing for a time was done at Toledo, under Deindoerfer's supervision, Chronik, 94, then at Davenport, perhaps to transfer supervision to Hoerlein, but the printing there was very bad, p. 100. Shortly afterward the printing was taken over by Pilger, Reading, Pennsylvania, p. 101, and still later by Wiebusch in St. Louis, who had printed the Lutheraner, before Missouri established its own printery, p. 139. For some of the firms names and dates can be told from the imprints, but not for all.

[5] A letter, Hoerlein - G. Fritschel, Iowa City, November 17, 1879, in I. S. D., indicates that he was willing to reestablish a printery. Another, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, May 3, 1871, in I. S. D., urges that the synod reestablish it. The resolution of 1871 is noted Chronik, 98, with the statement that it was never enforced. K. B. XIV, 23, 203, reports that this was to be done as soon as possible. Hoerlein may have been working toward it, but he died two years later.

The Kirchenblatt continued monthly publication until 1868, when it began to appear twice a month.[7] The convention of 1867 also concerned itself with the contents once again. Since another outlet for theological papers had been established, promises were made to give the paper a somewhat more popular tone.[8] A considerable change in this respect, however, did not occur until a few years later when Pastor Hoerlein became editor.[9] Thereafter the *Kirchenblatt* introduced a more varied content calculated to have a wider appeal. In the meantime, synodical conventions had continued to make suggestions in this respect, going so far in 1871 as to declare that the synodical organ should serve primarily the congregations rather than the needs of pastors.[10] In the same year the convention again discussed the attitude which the paper should take in regard to doctrinal controversy and reaffirmed the decision that it should be avoided. Disputes with Missouri were in question and the synod held that they were likely to degenerate into offensive personalities and it therefore instructed the editors to disregard spiteful attacks.[11] During the next biennium, however, editor Hoerlein largely disregarded the injunction to avoid controversy, although he tried to carry it on on a dignified level, in order to win from Missouri a recognition of Iowa's Lutheranism. He did not succeed and, as the convention had anticipated, replies, however moderate, only increased the intensity of attacks.[12] At the convention of 1873 the editor's policy was sharply criticized, but the convention issued no reprimand. It recognized his endeavors to render the paper more popular and to increase its circulation, but accepted his resignation, asking him, however, to remain in charge provisionally until the Ausschuss could provide a successor.[13]

---

[6] The arrangement was made by the Ausschuss, Chronik, 130. No indication is given of the source of the capital required for equipment. The convention of 1879 ratified the contract, p. 155.

[7] Zusammenstellung 1867 notes that the convention had decided this. The subscription price was raised to $1. In 1875 $.10 was added for postage to conform with new postal regulations, K. B. XVIII, 1, 8. Collection of postage from recipients had been a problem before that. The page size was increased in 1872 and in the last few years, issues appeared every two weeks.

[8] Zusammenstellung 1867 noted that shorter and simpler articles were to appear and contributions solicited. Chronik, 84, notes complaints, but does not specify. K. B. X, 9, 70-1, reported that theological articles would thereafter appear in Theologische Monatshefte.

---

[9] G. Fritschel became sole editor in 1867. He resigned in 1871 and Grossmann and Hoerlein became co-editors. Grossmann's resignation in 1872 left Hoerlein sole editor. The changes are noted *K*. *B*. X, 8, 64; XIV, 13 and XV, 13.

[10] In 1868 several suggestions were made, asking for regular reports on the seminary, the orphanages and on important occurrences in the synod, as well as on important church news from America and Europe and occasionally on developments in foreign missions. Installations, ordinations and church dedications were also to be chronicled regularly, *K*. *B*. XI, 23, 178-9. In 1871 a more varied content was stipulated,--accounts of missions, Christian experiences, historical articles, etc., XIV, 21, 162.

[11] *Ibid*., 162-3. Reference was made to an agreement at the colloquy of 1867, according to which personal attacks were to be avoided.

---

[12] The theological issues involved need not be traced here. The controversy can be followed in the Kirchenblatt and the Lutheraner 1871-1873. Hoerlein's desire for recognition was repeatedly expressed, e. g., XV, 5, 37-9. Chronik, 98, also discussed the resolutions of 1871 and later noted Hoerlein's departure from them, giving him credit for the best of intentions, but questioning his wisdom, p. 114.

[13] K. B. XVI, 23, 171, reports the resolutions passed in 1873 with the notation that they came partly from a committee and partly from the floor. Beschluesse 1873 in I. S. D. also brings them including the statement that Hoerlein had not deliberately violated a synodical regulation, but had been driven by circumstances to testify for his synod. It notes that certain parts of the committee report, which it does not describe, had been stricken. It may be that the statement given was substituted for a more critical report. An appropriation of $100 to Hoerlein as partial compensation for sacrifices he had made was also noted. That criticism was voiced which was not reflected in the resolutions is clear from Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 83-87, which also indicates that Hoerlein, irritated by other matters also, resented it for a time. Bericht...Untersuchung, 87-89, corroborates the criticism, but puts the entire matter in a different light and indicates that personal irritation was soon wholly eliminated. Hoerlein died before the year ended and a committee edited the Kirchenblatt for the rest of the period. G. Fritschel was chairman. In 1879 Deindoerfer became editor, with several assistants, Chronik, 115, 155.

While controversy was avoided for a year or two, it flared up again and rather sharply during the crisis of 1875.[14] After 1876 it died down again, but was not wholly eliminated in the last few years of the period.[15]

In 1867 the number of subscribers was given as 800 and this number permitted the Kirchenblatt to exist rather precariously.[16] During the next few years, efforts to make the paper more popular were accompanied by endeavors to expand the circulation. Hoerlein was active in this respect and for a time used an agent, who was also to sell literature. By 1872 the number of readers had risen to 1,000-1,200.[17] There were renewed appeals in the Kirchenblatt itself and at district conventions in the later seventies to get more subscribers, but they seem to have had indifferent results, for in 1879 there were still only about 1,200 readers.[18] Subscriptions seem generally to have been taken by pastors, who ordered and remitted for members of their congregations. This system apparently produced both confusion and arrearages which sometimes grew quite large.[19] Synodical conventions made rules on payments designed to meet these problems, but while efficient bookkeeping was achieved, the arrears were

---

[14] Recriminations became so intense that protests concerning their tone seem to have come from within the synod. A letter, Hertel - --, Nauvoo, June 25, 1876, in I. S. D. is directed against one article, but deplores the whole matter. The controversy was soon dropped.

[15] Bitterness was avoided, but criticism of doctrinal positions, particularly in regard to predestination appeared.

[16] Chronik, 84, gives this information and notes that the pastors were asked to concern themselves with increasing circulation.

[17] Ibid., 101, brings the revised circulation figure. A letter, Hoerlein - G. Fritschel, Iowa City, November 17, 1870, in I. S. D., mentions the agent and suggests a commission of ten cents per subscription. Pastor Wiederaenders was the agent. Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 83, gives Hoerlein credit for financial betterment and increased circulation, an assertion that was uncontested. Beschluesse 1873 in I. S. D. credited the changes which Hoerlein had made in the contents with a considerable expansion of circulation.

A letter, Hoerlein - --, Iowa City, July 3, 1872, in I. S. D., gives a total of 1,150 subscriptions of which 1,035 were paying. For the last year the total gain was 283, the net gain 134.

[18] Deindoerfer, *Denkschrift 25*, 16, deplored the small circulation of hardly more than 1,200 readers. *K*. *B*. XX, 24, 188-9, brought an open letter to its readers, suggesting efforts to increase the circulation and defending its contents. In the same year the president's report to the Eastern District convention stated that something should be done about the fact that there were only 330 subscribers in that district, XXI, 14, 107, and the district responded by admonishing pastors to work for better circulation and suggesting that they be sent several samples for distribution for this purpose every six months, 15, 126-7. The Western District had dealt with payments of arrearages in 1876, XIX, 14, 108.

[19] This system of handling subscriptions had been in use since the beginning. Confusion arose partly because pastors often sent names and small remittances in letters dealing with other matters with the result that they sometimes were not properly entered. Letters in the I. S. D. from the earlier period sometimes have such criticisms. In 1868 the editor was relieved of the accounts and after that no such complaints have come to the writer's notice. *Zusammenstellung* 1868 in I. S. D. carries a resolution to this effect. Hoerlein handled the accounts again. A part of the trouble seems to have been unsystematic bookkeeping by overburdened officials and this did not recur under Hoerlein, nor later when the work was probably divided between committee members. As to arrears a list of them in 1873 can be found in a report by Hoerlein on the *Kirchenblattkasse* on a leaf in Iowa Synod Financial Records. They then totalled $874 in amounts ranging from $1 to $104.50 with several between $40-$50. Hoerlein doubted whether they were all collectible. The published report gave the amount as about $800, which may indicate that he thought about $75 should be written off, *K*. *B*. XVI, 24, 188.

difficult to collect.[20] The treasury carried a debt partly on their account and partly no doubt from the earlier printery expansion, which was, however steadily reduced in the later part of the period and possibly extinguished before it ended.[21] A resolution from the first decade, appropriating printery profits to the seminary library, was renewed in a modified form for the benefit of both educational institutions in 1873 and some such allocations were made.[22]

---

[20] The treasury seems to have been called both *Kirchenblattkasse* and *Druckereikasse*. In regard to the latter *Beschluesse* 1873 carried a resolution that those who did not pay arrears after repeated requests should be admonished in order, through a neighboring pastor, their conference, the synod. The Western District resolved in 1876 that *Kirchenblatt* bills should be paid during the subscription year, arrears as soon as possible, *K*. *B*. XIX, 17, 108. It may be noted that in 1871 the editors had received permission to accept appropriate advertising, as well as to enlarge the paper, if circulation warranted it, and did both; also that one free copy was to go with every ten paid subscriptions, which probably encouraged pastors to win subscribers and thus to receive their own copy gratis, *Chronik*, 163.

[21] An accounting in 1872 did not give the debt total, but indicated that $100 had been paid off, *K*. *B*. XV, 3, 23-4. Another in 1873 probably including the preceding, gave the debt as $795.24 covered by about $800 in arrears, XVI, 24, 188. Hoerlein's report cited in footnote 19 reports a debt reduction of $585.25 over the years 1871-3. An accounting for 1873-5 in *Chronik*, 124, does not give details, but reports income and outgo figures for the *Kirchenblatt* of about the same size as those which covered the debt payment and other expenses 1873-1875. It left a surplus of almost $300, stemming from the sale of the old printery, etc., on hand. If as much debt had been paid as in the preceding biennium, the surplus should have covered remaining debts.

[22] Each institution was to receive up to $40 annually for this purpose, *K*. *B*. XVI, 24, 188; *Beschluesse* 1873 in I. S. D. Hoerlein's cited report in the same year contained items of $79.05 for the seminary and $49.25 for the college.

The Kirchenblatt was the synodical organ, whose services were indispensable, but since it had been decided that it was to be issued primarily for laymen it no longer served all purposes. A need for a separate theological magazine had already been felt in the first decade. For a time this need was served when Pastor S. Brobst began publishing the Theologische Monatshefte in 1868 as a forum for theological discussion in the Lutheran church of America. Among others he invited Iowa pastors to write for this magazine. Both theological professors became fairly regular contributors, with extended articles on theological controversies of the day. A considerable number of other pastors wrote less frequently and more briefly. During the six years in which this publication appeared, Iowa contributions filled half the space for a number of years and thereafter at least one-third. This outlet was closed, however, when this magazine suspended publication at the end of 1873.[23] At its next convention in 1875 the synod resolved to issue its own theological magazine. The immediate occasion was furnished by a series of articles in Missouri's Lutheraner, by Prof. F. Schmidt, which had strongly impugned not only the position, but also the integrity of the synod and of its leaders. The convention ordered a thorough study of these articles, and a reply, which was to appear in its new publication. The magazine was to appear as a quarterly for the time being and to be edited by the theological faculty and its accounts were to be handled separately.[24] Under the title Kirchliche Zeitschrift the first issue appeared in January 1876. For the rest of the period the magazine was devoted primarily to theological controversy, the reply to the Schmidt articles occupying much of the space through most of the first two years. Most of the material was written by the editors, though a number of pastors, especially Deindoerfer, made contributions. Of practical matters, liturgical forms and suggestions received most attention. Since the magazine had no great appeal for laymen, its subscription list was small, but most of the pastors of the synod took it, as well as a number of prominent clergymen in American and German circles.[25]

---

[23] The editor took note, Theologische Monatshefte, VI, 12, 382-3, of Missouri complaints, that Iowa had been given too much space. He replied that he had published every Missouri paper which he had received and that Iowa articles had been written chiefly on request. Publication seems to have been suspended chiefly, because controversy had a tendency to become acrimonious. Brobst had a well known publishing firm at Allentown, Pennsylvania, which among other things published the widely read Lutherische Zeitschrift and Der Lutherische Kalender, an annual almanac for the Lutheran Church in America.

---

[24] Synodalbericht 1875 reports on the reply, p. 24, and the magazine, p. 30. Chronik, 123, connects the two. Bredow was to handle accounts and promote subscriptions. The publication was actually bi-monthly from the first, normally with thirty-two pages. The subscription price was $1.25 per year. Printing was at first by Wiebush, St. Louis and later by the synodical printery.

[25] There is little information on business matters, particularly in regard to costs. Bredow seems to have sought to sign up the pastors present at the convention of 1875, for the convention of the Western District of 1876 asked him to continue efforts begun there. Pastors were, however, asked to call the magazine to the attention of their congregations occasionally, K. B. XIX, 14, 108. Liste der Abonnenten der Kirchl. Zeitschrift 1877 in Iowa Synod Financial

Special articles and pamphlets on timely questions were occasionally ordered published during the period, often in the Kirchenblatt and later in the Kirchliche Zeitschrift, as well as by other publishers, while either the old or the new synodical printery occasionally published pamphlets.[26] Providing texts for use in parochial schools was a perennial problem during the period. A school hymnal and a catechism had been published by the synodical printery during the first decade, the former passed out of use, while a new edition of

---

Records gives a total number of 162 American subscribers, of whom twenty-five were stricken out. There were also six exchanges and twenty-three German subscriptions many of which may have been complimentary and one of which was stricken out. Most of the subscribers took one magazine, but eighteen took from two to seventeen, though several had reduced the number. The total of extra subscriptions ran to forty-three. About twenty subscriptions went to Missouri clergymen. Among German addresses were Wuchererer, Stirner and Deinzer of the Gesellschaft, Vilmar, Chrestien, Muenkel, Luthardt. Among American subscribers outside of the synod may be mentioned, Krauth, Spaeth, von Rohr, Moldehnke, Stellhorn, W. Grabau. Of those who left synod in 1875 Vollmar and Doehler subscribed, while several others were stricken out, perhaps representing cancelled Madison subscriptions.

[26] The convention of 1867, e. g., authorized articles on the 350th anniversary of the Reformation by Klindworth and on the Castle Garden mission by Deindoerfer in the Kirchenblatt and provided for publication there of a sermon on inner mission by Bredow and of Kroenke's article on congregational membership. It also asked G. Fritschel to write a tract on secret societies and Schieferdecker one on Reisepredi̇ger missions, the former to be published by Brobst, Zusammenstellung 1867 in I. S. D. Most of these assignments were reported as executed in the copy annotated for enforcement and Kroenke's article appeared subsequently. No copy has come to hand of Schieferdecker's tract, but it may have been published by the synodical printery. The latter did publish Gutachten der Dorpater Theol. Facultaet. The reply to Schmidt's articles in the Kirchliche Zeitschrift has already been mentioned and that magazine also published Deindoerfer's Denkschrift 25, both subsequently appearing as pamphlets from

the latter was ordered in 1873.[27] As for texts in other fields, a committee was suggested by the convention of 1867 to examine and recommend books. It does not seem to have been created, however, for the president again suggested to the convention of 1871 that such a committee should be created. The convention accepted the suggestion, but limited the committee to a study of catechisms. This convention also requested two pastors to work out a draft for a German primer or Fibel and resolved that texts published by the synod should gradually be introduced in all congregations.[28] During

---

the new Defiance press. The only synodical report printed during the period, that of 1875, was published by Wiebusch of St. Louis.

[27] A letter, Oestliche Pastoralconferenz - Praesidium ...Syn. von Iowa, Defiance, May 3, 1873, in I. S. D., brought a resolution from the conference to the convention of 1873 which noted that 500-700 copies of the hymnal, unbound, were still on hand and suggested that every pastor take ten to twelve copies to clear them out at $.30 inclusive of $.10 for binding, suggesting them for home use or gifts. The convention resolved instead that pastors sell them at that price and ordered the new edition of the Spruchbuch catechism, Beschluesse 1873 in I. S. D. By 1875 receipts of $89.42 from hymnal sales were reported, Chronik, 124; K. B. XVIII, 20, 159, indicates that 526 were sold at $.17 each.

[28] The 1867 resolution is in Zusammenstellung 1867 in I. S. D. The writer has discovered no evidence that it was carried out. At the same time provision was made for school visitations, examinations and festivals and it may be that the committee was also to make recommendations in regard to them and that it confined itself to this task. The president's report in 1871 mentioned the necessity of recommending books and asked for a committee to which he could submit suggestions, K. B. XIV, 13, 99. The committee named was to consist of pastors and professors and was to edit a suitable catechism on basis of its findings. Pastors Baumbach and Foelsch were to prepare the Fibel, 23, 207.

the next biennium two Fibel projects were developed by the two pastors, but neither found approval. A group of pastors worked out another draft which combined several different methods of teaching how to read and the orphanage at Andrew had this draft published. The convention of 1873 accepted this publication.[29] In regard to the catechism some work was also done, but the convention decided on the reissue of its own which has been noted, and also recommended another which had been printed by the Eastern Conference.[30] In regard to other texts the Eastern Conference suggested to the convention of 1873 that until the synod could issue its own books, no requirement of uniformity should be made. Good texts might be recommended and synodical officers ought to check on whether good books were used, but a choice should be left open. A committee accordingly prepared a list of thirteen titles which was published.[31]

---

[29] The difficulty with the Fibel seems to have been that different methods of teaching how to read were in use. Apparently the two authorized drafts were each based on a particular method and were not satisfactory to the proponents of others. Perhaps the committee of 1871 had broader functions than the resolution indicated, or else a special committee was set up to examine the two drafts, at any rate a committee failed to approve them. The procedure which produced the Fibel which was printed, the orphanage providing for the expenses, was conceded not to have been authorized. This Fibel was not wholly satisfactory, chiefly because it tried to combine three different methods. But it contained detailed instructions in regard to use and was deemed more satisfactory than three different texts, K. B. XVI, 15, 115-6; 17, 126. It was recommended and the price was set at twenty cents. The convention resolved that the orphanage was to publish it for five years to recover its investment, thereafter the synod was to have publication rights, 24, 187; Beschluesse 1873 in I. S. D.

[30] The president's report in 1873 referred to a study of Loehe's Catechism which had been submitted to the conferences, K. B. XVI, 17, 131. The Eastern Conference catechism is mentioned only in Chronik, 114.

Lack of a suitable church hymnal had been a bothersome problem from the earliest days of the synod. When the synod entered into association with the newly organized General Council, it became possible to seek a solution of this problem in concert with other Lutheran church bodies. The convention of 1867, accordingly resolved to await action by the General Council. The first convention of that body adopted canons for selection of hymns and authorized a subcommittee to undertake preparation of a German hymnal in the same year.[32] The committee as constituted in 1867 included Grossmann, later S. Fritschel became a member and continued to serve until the hymnal was completed. The work, however, proceeded only slowly. A synodical hymnal committee submitted a list of hymns for inclusion, and members of the synod studied drafts and submitted criticisms, which in turn were studied by conferences.[33] The convention of 1873 resolved to inform the General Council that the synod needed a hymnal immediately and that it must approximate in content the suggestions made by the synod. The Ausschuss was to consider the reply and if it were unsatisfactory, the synod should undertake publication of its own hymnal, using the draft of its hymnal committee, which the two theological professors and Klindworth were to revise.[34] This alternative course did not become necessary and the work on the Council hymnal continued. The convention of 1875 again called the attention of the General Council to its great need of the hymnal and urged it to have it published if possible during 1875. It was not until 1877, however, that the *Kirchenbuch* was published. Under a favorable contract, it thereafter gradually came to be the synodical hymnal.[35]

---

[31] The Eastern Conference recommendation is in the letter cited in footnote 27. The recommended books are listed in K. B. XVI, 24, 187, and in part in Chronik, 114. They included the Fibel and the two catechisms which have been mentioned, also the old school hymnal as well as another, a biblical history, German and English readers, a grammar, an arithmetic, and drawing materials. Three titles were in English. For later proposals in regard to school texts, see footnote 44.

[32] The Iowa resolution is in Zusammenstellung 1867 in I. S. D. and the action of the Council is reported in: General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, First Convention, Fort Wayne, Indiana, November 20-26, A. D. 1867, 29-30.

---

[33] Exact information is scanty. It seems probable that the General Council subcommittee called on interested synods to make suggestions. The Iowa Hymnal committee was mentioned at the convention of 1871, which ordered that criticisms submitted by Hoerlein, in K. B. XIII, 22, 174-5, and Theologische Monatshefte, III, 9, 267-96, be studied by the conferences and that their findings be submitted to the committee, K. B. XIV, 23, 207. The president's report in 1873 stated that Grossmann had no information on what the conferences had done, but that the Wartburg committee had studied drafts submitted by Klindworth and by S. Fritschel and on basis of them had instructed S. Fritschel to submit a revised draft to the Council, XVI, 17, 131. According to Chronik, 114, this had been done in 1872.

[34] K. B. XVI, 24, 187; Beschluesse 1873 in I. S. D.; Chronik, 114. Klindworth sought to induce the synod to proceed with the publication of his draft, but was opposed by S. Fritschel. Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 78-9; Bericht...Untersuchung, 78.

The synod also came to feel that a need existed for a depository, where pastors could order books, stationery and other needed supplies. This need was felt all the more keenly, since the synod was intent upon disseminating Christian literature in its congregations. In 1867 a resolution provided that several depositories should be opened in important locations, stocking good literature which was to be sold by agents. No provision was made for financing these centers, but details were left to the conferences, who were to report to the next convention. As might have been expected there was nothing to report in 1868 and the plan was apparently dropped.[36] In 1870 Pastor Hoerlein opened a book store at Iowa City to serve synodical needs at his own risk. He borrowed funds from several individuals as operating capital and secured credit from German publishers.[37] Hoerlein had plans of building up this enterprise and combining publication ventures with it, which involved the reestablishment of a synodical printery.[38] To the convention of 1871 he reported a satisfactory beginning. The book store was operated for the benefit of the synod, to which he expected to turn it over

---

[35] *Synodalbericht* *1875*, 30. Adoption of the hymnal by the Western District in *1877* was reported, *K*. *B*. XV, 23, 179. Chronik, 138, notes *Ausschuss* approval of favorable terms.

[36] *Zusammenstellung* *1867*, annotated for enforcement in I. S. D. It was also provided that inquiries into the use of Christian literature should be made at visitations and the visitation reports in I. S. D. indicate that this was done.

[37] The opening was reported *Chronik*, 94, which gave the time as late in 1870. It also stated that profits were to go to the synod, though the risk was Hoerlein's, but this must refer to a later period, when the synod had taken the store over, for the profits for some time had to go toward the capital investment. A letter, Hoerlein - G. Fritschel, Iowa City, November 17, 1870, in I. S. D., proposing certain

---

publications, suggested a division of proceeds on the basis of two-fifths each for himself and for an agent and the remaining one-fifth for expenses. From another letter, Hoerlein - --, Iowa City, July 3, 1872 in I. S. D., it appears that funds had been borrowed from the mission treasury and from S. Fritschel, Mr. Hoeger and Pastor Graening. The amount cannot be told. The credits from German publishers are also mentioned. Repayments were being made and interest was being paid. The starting capital must have been small for the earlier letter mentioned borrowing $25 up to November 1871.

[38] The cited letter of November 10, 1870, makes it clear that Hoerlein had already employed Pastor Wiederaenders as agent, who for the present was not to carry samples, but to take orders for bibles, etc., and learn what was in demand. Hoerlein could then build up his stock accordingly and the agent could carry samples. Apparently the agent was also to collect Kirchenblatt arrears. To get capital Hoerlein proposed to publish a sermon book on a subscription plan, either a republication or a new one, written by Iowa pastors. He also suggested the Fibel and had already approached Pastor Foelsch. He was willing to publish the Kirchenblatt also, but for the present his proposed press would not be suitable and he would do it on contract. It may be mentioned here that there was some demand for a press, for G. Fritschel had already published a book of Lenten meditations in Germany and was negotiating on writings about Indian missions, see letters, Brobst - G. Fritschel, Allentown, August 13, 1868; Warneck - G. Fritschel, Barmen (Germany), August 8, 1873, in I. S. D. See also Doehler - Grossmann, Paducah, February 16, 1872, Ibid., which inquired about financing and printing a tract on Jewish missions. Immediately, however, these plans could not be carried through. Another letter, Hoerlein - G. Fritschel, Iowa City, April 17, 1871, in I. S. D., put the decision on printing up to the synod and noted that his agent could no longer travel, apparently because of illness. It has already been noted that the convention of 1871 authorized a synodical printery at Iowa City, but that none was established. It is probable, however, that Hoerlein was working toward that end.

when it was fully developed. Profits at present had to go toward accumulating operating capital. Later they should go to the synod, particularly to its educational institutions. Hoerlein would operate the business until it had developed to the point where a manager could be engaged. The convention had the books checked and after a satisfactory report resolved to recommend the store to its pastors and to turn over to Hoerlein the sale of synodical publications.[39] The book store continued to make satisfactory progress during the next biennium and the convention of 1873 took it over on behalf of the synod.[40] The sudden and untimely death of Hoerlein late in that year was a heavy blow to the enterprise. There seems to have been a considerable delay about making new arrangements for its operation, but it was finally turned over to Pastor List and relocated at Mendota.[41] By 1875 it showed a loss.[42] In 1877 Pastor F. Richter took over the management.[43] District conventions in 1876 and 1877 concerned themselves with problems of financing and reorganizing the enterprise, but it languished and eventually died.[44]

---

[39] K. B. XIV, 23, 206. The catechism and the school hymnal were the publications mentioned. It was in connection with this report that the printery was authorized.

[40] In 1872 a financial report gave total sales November 1870 to January 15, 1872, as $2,741.10. Inventory was listed at $1,593.50 and debts were $1,298.10, K. B. XV, 3, 23-24. A letter, Hoerlein - --, November 13, 1872, reported that, after a dull summer, business was now good and that Hoerlein expected soon to have a capital of $600-$700 which would be enough to operate. Beschluesse 1873 reports the action of synod.

[41] Several letters, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, November 9; October 22; December 18, 1873, in I. S. D., urged that the book store be carried on for Hoerlein's sake, suggested that it be located at Galena and managed by Lutz and proposed that it be turned over to Mrs. Hoerlein to be run at her own risk. It had been a mistake to take it over so soon, it should be turned back provisionally until synod could approve.

The synod also continued to carry the charitable activities which had been begun during the first decade. Since most of the pastors were young men, at most in their early twenties when they joined the synod, the care of aged pastors had not yet become a pressing problem by 1879. There were, however, cases of illness which led to resignation from congregations or even retirement from office. In some of

---

Later it could be taken back again. The last letter deplored the fact that the good Christmas season had been allowed to pass without action. Business had been poor, because of uncertainty. Chronik, 115, reports that List took it over in 1873, but does not say when. It is also not clear when it was located in Mendota, but List who was also secretary and treasurer of the synod and in 1875 took over supervision and teaching at the college, soon was located there.

[42] A financial report in 1875 showed income of $3,944.15 and expenses of $4,071.21 since 1873, Chronik, 124; K. B. XVIII, 20, 159.

[43] Chronik, 137. List returned to a pastoral charge at that time.

[44] The Western District resolved in 1876 to open a subscription list on its behalf, subscribers to assume interest on stated sums or to make non-interest bearing loans for two years, K. B. XIX, 14, 118. Grossmann reported to the Eastern District in 1877 that western pastors had agreed to a reorganization, under which only needed books would be handled and eastern and western depositories were to be established. However school books such as a Fibel and an arithmetic were to be published. The district named Mr. Kuehn to handle the depository in the east and established a committee on school books, XX, 17, 131. Among the subjects discussed at the western convention in 1877 was publication of practical school books, Chronik, 137-8. Just when the book business

these cases temporary emergencies developed, which called for assistance until recovery made it possible to take another charge or find another occupation. So far as the evidence available goes, such cases were met by contributions from fellow pastors through the conferences.[45] In 1871 the convention provided that the president should in cases of illness of pastors, appoint a committee in order to secure support for them.[46] More acute was the problem of providing for the widows and families of pastors who died comparatively young. The Pfarrwitwenkasse established in 1859 and provided with additional regulations in 1864 was to care for such cases. Since a number of such deaths occurred, there were calls on this treasury and soon need for additional regulation was felt.

---

was abandoned cannot be stated. The fact is noted in Synodalbericht 1888, 52, when a synodical agency established in 1885 mentioned a small remainder of the earlier book store in its report.

[45] Letters, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Toledo, February 28, 1868; Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, March 23, 1869, in I. S. D., refer to pastors Oetjens and Ide in the east, both of whom had to give up their congregations because of illness and H. Hempeler in the west, who was in service, but hampered by illness. In all cases contributions from pastors were sought, through collectors to be appointed by conferences. In the former case the Eastern Conference had appointed one and asked the others do so also. Deindoerfer also suggested a general offering in case of continued disability, which he did not anticipate. Hempeler and Ide remained in service, Oetjens retired. There is no mention of aid through the Gademann Society, in all probability its resources did not suffice as yet, to give much assistance.

[46] K. B. XIV, 21, 162. No evidence of such a committee came to hand.

The convention of 1867 resolved to double the contributions of pastors for this purpose and to enlist aid from the congregations as well, naming a committee to give further study to the problem.[47] In the next year the committee presented a draft for a constitution for the Pfarrwitwenkasse, which was discussed and put into provisional force until the next synod, while the conferences were to study it in the meanwhile. Under it pastors were to pay annual dues of $2 per year and special assessments of $1 whenever deaths of members occurred, and in the latter case also to raise a special offering for the treasury in their congregations. Widows of pastors and teachers were eligible for support within the means of the treasury. A committee, whose members were to function as president, secretary, and treasurer, was to invest funds and administer the treasury, announce the special offerings, publish all receipts in the Kirchenblatt and report to the synod. In cases of death, they were to allow widows $50 immediately and fix a provisional pension, while the synod at its next session would make permanent provision.[48] The convention of 1869 adopted this constitution definitely with additional clauses providing that pastors honorably dismissed from the synod could retain membership if they so desired and that in cases of retirement from the ministry, the committee might act provisionally, until the next convention could decide on membership rights.[49]

---

[47] Zusammenstellung 1867 in I. S. D. The contribution thus came to be $2 per year.

[48] Zusammenstellung 1868 in I. S. D. notes adoption. The constitution is in K. B. XI, 23, 178. Pastors were to pay within the first quarter. Failure to pay for two years would forfeit membership, but reinstatement was possible through payment of arrears. The convention added a provision, specifying that decisions on cases not covered by the constitution were reserved to the synod. Chronik, 88-9, also has the constitution and gives Klindworth, Bredow and Schueller

The first death which affected the *Pfarrwitwenkasse* occurred late in 1870. Early the next year a special offering was announced and a special assessment levied, both meeting a general but not unanimous response.[50] A second death only a few months later resulted in another assessment, but

---

as committee members. It adds that the resources of the treasury amounted to $274.10 in 1868.

[49] *K. B.* XII, 24, 189; *Chronik*, 91. Pastors who never belonged to the synod and did not wish to join, could not become members. The constitution was to be printed at the expense of the treasury.

[50] The death of Pastor Schorr occurred December 24, 1870. Announcement of offering and assessment, the latter by error $2 rather than $1, came on February 1, 1871, in *K. B.* XIV, 3, 21-2. Receipts on both accounts are in 18, 143-4; 19, 152; 20, 159-60. They covered sixty-five pastors (the synod had a total of eighty at the time of the convention of 1870) who paid regular dues, special assessments, or remitted offerings, most of them all three. Many pastors paid arrears, in one case a total of $16 with the assessment, while payments of $6-$8 were common. Only ten did not pay regular dues at that time, some may have been paid up, others had just entered the ministry. Another ten sent no offering, while thirteen did not receive credit for the special assessment. On the other hand twenty-six paid the double assessment erroneously levied and, in 19, 152, were credited with it toward the second death of the year, payment from others being requested at that time. The special offering brought $436.71. Some offerings seem to have come in subsequently, for a report for the year 1871, *K. B.* XV, 11, supplement, lists $473.47. This report listed twenty-one blanks, but indicated that four parishes had lifted this offering, which raised no others.

no offering was announced.[51] The convention of the same year was induced by these deaths to make a number of regulations relating to support to be granted by the treasury. The regular annual pension for widows was set at $50, which was to be raised when the resources of the treasury permitted. From the proceeds of the special offerings the committee in charge might in cases where it was deemed necessary give additional support. For this purpose special offerings might be announced even in years when no deaths occurred, but in years when more than one death occurred, offerings should be raised only after the first.[52] This treasury thus began to function in 1871. Heavy payments of arrears indicate that many pastors had not regularly contributed to it before then. While it had been established as a synodical venture, some pastors seem to have considered membership voluntary and failed even in 1871 to make the required contributions.[53]

---

[51] Pastor Engel died April 1, 1871, well in advance of the convention of that year, which passed a regulation providing for only one offering a year. Technically the regulation should not have applied, because the deaths occurred in different years, even if it had been in effect. This was no doubt one of the cases for which the synod had reserved the right of decision and the committee delayed a decision until the convention met. The death is noted *K.B.* XIV, 21, 163.

[52] *K. B.*XIV, 22, 194-5; *Chronik*, 97, which indicates that the regulations were suggested by the committee in charge, but with some changes. The differentiation between regular and special support and the investment provision of 1868 indicate that regular contributions were invested in a fund, the interest of which was to pay regular pensions. What was done with special assessments does not appear. Proceeds of special offerings in excess of special aid requirements were undoubtedly expected to swell the fund.

[53] See the data in footnote 50. The statement of the resources in 1868 given in footnote 48, in the tenth year of

The burden upon the Pfarrwitwenkasse increased as further deaths occurred and the pensions granted soon came to be considered inadequate.[54] The committee accordingly recommended to the convention of 1873 that an entrance fee be charged, that the annual contribution be raised to $5 and that the offering be made a regular annual occasion on

---

existence, indicate that some pastors must have neglected payments or considered membership voluntary almost from the beginning, although it must be remembered that the membership was small and that the annual contribution had been only $1 over most of the period. A report K. B. XII, 24, 189, notes receipts of $155.60 for the past year, which probably included interest, but even so would indicate that some sixty of seventy-two pastors made contributions during that year, 1869. Since, however, the constitution had been referred to the conferences during its course, interest may have run unusually high just then.

[54] Flier died in 1872, leaving no family, but Grimm and Hoerlein, dying the next year, did. In 1873 a special offering was called before these deaths occurred with the notice that interest on the fund did not suffice to meet needs, K. B. XVI, 7, 56. When Grimm died shortly afterward, this offering was emphatically recommended, 10, 80. Hoerlein's death late in the same year was affected by the ruling against more than one offering in the same year. The committee then sent a circular to members, probably asking for voluntary effort to raise another offering. A letter, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, December 18, 1873, in I. S. D., refers to criticism of the circular by Grossmann to Bredow, but does not make clear what it contained. Klindworth held that it had violated no rules, but merely made an inquiry. In this way reactions of members could be obtained better than at conventions, where they were never all present. Klindworth's suggestion to turn the book store back to Mrs. Hoerlein has already been mentioned. He also suggested that a vicar be supplied at Iowa City for six months to a year, rather than a filling of the vacancy for her benefit and that a special offering wholly for her benefit be announced for 1874. See the letter of October 22, 1873, cited in footnote 41. All this implies inadequate support and the actions of the district conventions of 1874, to be noted, confirm this.

a designated Sunday, but the convention postponed action to the next synodical meeting.[55] At this time the question whether the treasury was a synodical undertaking, obligatory on all its members, or a voluntary association within the synod of pastors interested, began to come to the fore. Both district conventions in 1874 concerned themselves with the Pfarrwitwenkasse and both rejected the latter interpretation, the eastern group proposing that the names of pastors not contributing be furnished to the committee created in 1873 to deal with pastors not fulfilling their synodical obligations. Both also proposed that contributions be increased, regular annual offerings lifted and that pensions be raised, though they differed in details. Finally both proposed revision of the constitution and incorporation of the treasury.[56]

---

[55] K. B. XVI, 24, 188, gives the reason for postponement as lack of time. See also Beschluesse 1873 in I. S. D. That the proposals received some consideration is evident from K. B. XVII, 3, 23, which reports that a majority favored the increased fee effective 1874, but that an entrance fee was voted down. The increased fee does not seem to have gone into effect. No reference to the districts was indicated.

[56] Klindworth, president of the treasury, took the position that it was a society within the synod, which members of synod could join or leave without affecting synodical membership, in the letter of December 18, 1873. The eastern resolutions are in K. B. XVII, 14, 105-7; the western in XVIII, 6, 48. The east acted first and asked the west to concur, so that better care could be given widows. It asserted the past synodical character of the treasury, while the west did not, but both declared that it should be synodical, not private. The east proposed an annual fee of $5, the west $3. Both agreed on a regular annual offering, the west proposing a day between New Year and Easter. The east suggested regular annual pensions of $100 plus $25 for each child until confirmation and opposed increasing the existing fund, using current income for pensions. The west proposed a payment of $25 toward interment costs and a pension regularly of $75. These

The changes proposed by the western convention, which were more conservative in several respects, seem to have been put into provisional effect. A revised constitution came before the special convention of 1875 but that body was not ready to adopt it. It resolved to keep the western proposals of 1874 in effect until the next general convention and asked the committee in charge to prepare another draft giving consideration to the opinions which had been expressed during the debate as well as an alternative draft for the eventuality that the treasury might be transformed from a synodical enterprise into a voluntary association.[57] Though additional deaths before 1879 meant greater burdens, the resources of the treasury seem to have been adequate to meet them.[58] If the convention of 1879 took action, it merely continued the provisional arrangements of 1875.[59]

---

were to be paid from the fund to which pastoral contributions were to go. Offerings were to go into a separate account from which widows without property should receive additional support. The east proposed revision of the constitution, to incorporate the changes suggested, the west asked the committee to study other treasuries for similar purposes and on basis of its findings to propose a revised constitution to the next general convention.

[57] Synodalbericht 1875, 29-30; Chronik, 123-4. The expression "keep in effect" implies that the western resolutions were provisionally put into practice. The remark about the debate and the instruction imply great differences of opinion.

[58] The treasury reports of 1875 did not include the Pfarrwitwenkasse and no reports for 1879 could be found. In 1873 a report had given what was apparently the total income to that year as $1,651.55 and the expenses as $202.15, with a balance of $1,449.40 on hand. K. B. XVI, 24, 188.

[59] There is no indication that any action was taken. In 1882 the convention resolved to keep the resolution of 1875

In 1868 the Kirchenblatt brought graphic accounts of drouth and resulting famine conditions in East Prussia and in Finland and appealed to its readers to make contributions for relief purposes. This was the first appeal of this kind, since relief contributions for Kansas settlers had been gathered in the first decade and the first for foreign missions. Response was rather meager, but a fairly substantial sum was raised and sent.[60] An undertaking of another kind of different kind came some years later, after the death of Loehe in 1872. German circles began a movement to erect a monument and invited American students of the father of the synod to contribute. While response here was confined to pastors, it was general and brought a rather tidy sum, considering the circumstances of most of them.[61]

In its opposition to secret societies, the synod seems frequently to have found that the insurance features of these organizations were attractive to its members. Several pastors and laymen began to work on a plan for a mutual insurance company within the synod in order to offer a substitute.

---

which declared the treasury synodical in force until the following convention, Synodalbericht 1882, 27. It is possible that a new constitution was adopted without changing the synodical character, but it does not seem likely.

[60] K. B. XI, 8, 61-3; 10, 78; 11, 81-2. The first appeal appeared in April, by November $213.60 was reported as raised and sent, 20, 160.

[61] K. B. XVI, 15, 120; reports a total of $161. Some pastors who had not come from Neuendettelsau and even some who had not gone to Wartburg made contributions. About sixty individuals gave something, $2 was the most common gift, but one amounted to $25. One Missouri pastor, Hattstaedt, was listed.

During the convention of 1879 this project was presented to the members and an organization meeting took place at which some of them joined. The synod as such did not foster this enterprise, nor did the convention adopt it, but moral support was given and the pages of the Kirchenblatt were opened to a presentation of the cause and plea for membership.[62] The membership of the Lutheran Mutual Aid thus organized was restricted to Lutherans, but not to members of the synod. Local societies were to be formed which solicited members, collected fees, chose medical examiners, and whose representatives chose general officers and together with them formed the governing body. An entrance fee and semi-annual dues went into an expense fund, new members also paid a fee for medical examinations and another to their local society. In cases of death assessments were levied graduated with age and sex, which went into a beneficiary fund. Each certificate had a value of $1,000, but until the membership grew large enough, only what the assessments brought would be paid.

---

[62] Chronik, 157; K. B. XXII, 18, 144. The chief promoters of the plan were Pastor Ide and Mr. Boerner of Iowa City and Pastor Luz and Mr. Krueger of Dubuque. They had made a study of similar organizations and presented their plan as sound and as inexpensive, because heavy administrative costs were avoided and they stressed the matter of the secret societies. Krueger was elected president, Boerner secretary. Election of pastors had been avoided purposely to avoid giving the impression that the plan was for pastors only.

A second certificate might be taken, but only holders paid assessments toward meeting them.[63]

The two orphanages founded during the first decade continued to exist as institutions which drew on the synod for support and were recognized by it, but not as synodical undertakings for which the synod was responsible. It has already been mentioned that in 1867 a regular offering on the thirteenth Sunday after Trinity was authorized on their behalf. At the same time the synod asked the orphanages to submit their constitutions for approval and provided that they should be visited when visitations were held in their congregations and that reports on them should be made in the Kirchenblatt.[64] The synod thus gave a measure of support and in return assumed a measure of supervision, but it did not assume complete responsibility for their needs or for their administration. Both were free to seek support outside of synodical circles and both were or came to be in charge of societies in which direct responsibility was vested.[65]

---

[63] Constitution des Unterstuetzungsvereins der Deutschen Lutherischen Synode von Iowa und anderen Staaten. A printed constitution was mentioned in 1879, but the earliest copy the author has been able to find, (in the files of the Lutheran Mutual Insurance Company) is dated 1885. No great changes seem to have occurred during these years. Members of other synods were eligible, if the synods were recognized as Lutheran by Iowa and if they lived in states where Iowa had congregations or their immediate vicinity. Officers of the organization had to be members of Iowa. Local societies were given one representative for every fifty members. The general officers were paid $.50 per member, seven-ninths going to the secretary, one-ninth to each of the others. The entrance fee was $3, medical examination and local fee as well as annual dues $1. Assessment rates varied from $.90 to $1.80 for men and $1.10 to $1.80 for women. Admittance ages ran 18-55 years in four payment classes. When the membership grew large enough so that assessments brought more than was needed, the excess was to accumulate until an assessment could be passed.

During the first few years of the period, relations between the Toledo orphanage and the Eastern Conference became somewhat strained. Doerfler resigned his pastorate at Salem Church in Toledo in 1866 and became superintendent, organizing a separate orphanage congregation. An Orphans' Society existed, which does not seem to have included the eastern pastors. Doerfler travelled extensively for the support of the orphanage and seems to have drawn considerable support from non-synodical circles and also to have expected the synodical congregations to support the orphanage to the exclusion of other synodical causes.[66] In 1870 Doerfler resigned and withdrew from the synod to accept a call into the Ohio synod. His Orphans' Society was dissolved and title and management were transferred to a new society, of which Deindoerfer became president.[67] The new society was not restricted to members of the synod, but few non-members seem to have joined it. Pastors who were members were asked to form local societies, which were to become active in support, so that traveling to raise offerings for the cause could be abandoned.[68] The policy under the new order was to serve primarily Lutherans, but also children who could not otherwise be cared for in Christian families. Children with one parent, would be received within limitations of space and means, but parents were ordinarily expected to pay for them. If they did, they might take their children back at their discretion. Charity orphans, for whom the orphanage was usually responsible to their majority under court orders,

---

[64] Zusammenstellung 1867 in I. S. D. The copy annotated for enforcement indicates that no report had reached Grossmann, it is not recorded whether the constitutions were ever submitted. Reports in the Kirchenblatt appeared for Toledo on occasions of importance, rarely for Andrew. Bericht der Gemeinde Andrew, June 1, 1869, is signed by two representatives of the orphanage and has exceedingly favorable comment on it by the visitor (Grossmann) indicating that twenty-eight children were well cared for physically and spiritually. This is the only visitation report in I. S. D. for a congregation with an orphanage, but it indicates that the resolution was carried out.

[65] A letter, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, May 3, 1871, in I. S. D., suggests that the synod ought to assume control, or at least determine the extent to which it could support the orphanages. He referred to conflict between support for them and for educational institutions and resultant overburdening of the membership. Klindworth was deeply involved in the affairs of both Galena and Andrew. On behalf of Toledo Deindoerfer in 1870 took note of fears of such conflicts, but asserted that both types of institutions were needed and that Christian charity should not be centered exclusively on one, K.B.XIII, 11, 84-5. A report on Toledo in 1878 said that it might be well if the synod did operate the orphanage, but to do so would impair its educational work, XXI, 18, 143.

---

[66] Letters, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, January 24; March 26; May 21; October 2, 1866, in I.S. D., report these points and indicate that relations between himself as well as several other pastors and Doerfler were strained. He thought that Doerfler might leave the synod with the orphanage and perhaps go to Missouri, whose numerous and large congregations might provide adequate support. Doerfler also had come to differ with the synod's *Richtung* particularly on chiliasm. His efforts to win support sometimes alienated eastern pastors by his manner. See also a letter, Ide - Grossmann, May 9, 1866, in I. S. D. Deindoerfer's letters make it clear, however, that for a time Doerfler had some of the eastern pastors on his side.

[67] *K. B.* XIII, 11, 84-5; 18, 142. The new organization bore the name, *Gesellschaft fuer gemeinsame Werke der Barmherzigkeit im Sinne der evangel. luth. Kirche in Nord-Amerika*. According to *Chronik*, 94, it had been founded in Toledo in 1870. No month is given, but it is the first item listed for that year. It was reported founded at a conference when Grossmann was present, probably in January. Poppen, *Goldenes Jubilaeum*, 13, mentions a session January 26, 1870, in which officers were elected. No constitution is mentioned and the previous existence of the society seems taken for granted. No conference, nor Grossmann were mentioned, present were the Toledo pastors and their laymen. *K. B.* XVI, 9, 68-71, gives the organization date as August 4, 1869 and says that all eastern pastors joined January 27, 1870. The first *K. B.* source explains to society members that at a conference

---

in Bryan, Ohio, late in April matters came up which could not be postponed. The members present elected provisional trustees in order to incorporate and adopted a set of policies. They also resolved to ask Loehe to send a deaconess and a maid to take charge of the household. The orphanage had already been taken over immediately after Easter and a new manager, R. Riechmann, installed. It was emphasized that a change of personnel, not of purpose, was being made. The second *K. B.* source reports that it had been necessary to call a special meeting of the society in July, because of transfer difficulties. The old Orphans' Society had agreed to dissolve. Mr. Samson, one of its prominent members had been promised a trusteeship for as long as he would remain a member of the new society. The Bryan decisions had been ratified. It is clear from these accounts that the new society had been asked to take over the orphanage.

[68] *K. B.*XIII, 11, 84-5. The intention was expressed not to travel, however, 23, 182, indicates that the superintendent did do so. Societies may have been slow in forming, no record of them was found. *Chronik*, 94, speaks of putting the orphanage on a Lutheran basis, but indicates that members of other synods could join. Perhaps the older society had contained non-Lutherans. *K. B.* XXI, 18, 143, indicates that no members of other synods joined, but that some of their congregations gave support. Poppen, *Goldenes Jubilaeum* refers to generous

might after confirmation be placed in approved Christian homes to work, but the orphanage remained responsible, received their pay and cared for their needs.[69]

Pastor Beckel became superintendent when the new society took over the orphanage, retaining his nearby pastorate and was to hold office until his death in 1894. The institution had a separate manager, a position held by Mr. F. Riechmann until 1876 and Mr. H. Christel thereafter, who among other things continued to travel to raise offerings as Doerfler had done.[70] A deaconess had been requested from the Gesellschaft to serve as housemother, but none could be sent. The society a few years later, sent a girl to Neuendettelsau for training, who after a year returned to take the position, but resigned after a few years.[71] The new society originally had plans to found a deaconess motherhouse and a hospital, thus returning to ideas originated by Doerfler. Loehe took a personal interest in this phase of the activities and made substantial

---

support and cordial cooperation from pastors of the Ohio and the Michigan Synods.

[69] K. B. XIII, 11, 84-5. Parents were to pay $6 toward board and clothes, but it was not stated for what period. An executive committee could give reductions, but only full paying parents had the privilege of withdrawal at discretion.

[70] Poppen, Goldenes Jubilaeum, 13-16. The manager was in charge of economic management, including the farm. An unsatisfactory appointee held office for three months between Riechmann and Christel.

[71] Ibid., 15. Sister Anna Lutz came from Detroit. K. M., N. F., IV, 7, 54-5, reports that no deaconess could be sent, it is not clear whether none was available, or whether none would go to America.

donations for that purpose, but plans could not be carried out and seem to have been dropped after the first few years of the new society which after the resignation of Sister Anna Lutz did not employ deaconesses.[72]

In 1870 the orphanage cared for thirty to forty children. It carried a debt of $2,200, which the new society took over. The staff consisted of the superintendent, who at the time was doing the teaching, though regularly a teacher was employed, the manager and his wife and two or three others. Income seems to have come in large part from special offerings and from the annual orphans' festival, while payments were received for five children.[73] In 1878 and in 1879 the orphanage cared for forty-seven children. The annual income amounted to about $2,000. The debt in 1879 had been reduced to $350. A considerable amount of support was still received from other synods. A report in 1878 stated that if the Ohio Synod would, as reported, establish an orphanage of its own, this might lead to a serious loss of income.[74]

---

[72] Poppen, Goldenes Jubilaeum mentions these plans briefly. No reason for dropping them is given, probably adequate means were not available despite Loehe's donation. A leaflet Statuten der Gesellschaft fuer gemeinsame Werke der Barmherzigkeit seems to be the original constitution. No printing date is given, the date of adoption was January 26, 1870, It does not specifically mention orphanages, but gives foundation of eleemosynary institutions as a major objective and training of deaconesses as another. K. M., N. F., II, 7, 49-51, indicates that the society originally applied for several deaconesses, to take charge of the work and to train American deaconesses. They had been promised, if appropriate conditions could be established. The society had been founded to create such conditions. A fund of $1,600 was mentioned as collected for America, but invested in Germany and granted for this purpose. It would seem that the society was originally founded for this broader purpose and that the orphans' society then turned its work over. An excerpt from a letter, Sievers - Marianne Loehe, Frankenlust, October 22, 1873, marked copy and signed by Bauer, in I. S. D., indicates that through Sievers by that time $813 had been paid to Toledo. The letter refers to a request of S. Fritschel that the Loehe estate pay the old von Tucher fund, long since granted the seminary, but never paid, which report also seems to have been made to the society. See a letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, August 10, 1873, which also remarks that less than half the Loehe legacy to the orphanage had been paid then. According to K. B. XVI, 9, 68-71, $2,000 had been promised and by 1873 $907.78 had been paid. It may be added that the seminary claim was never paid. See

The orphanage at Andrew was engaged in a struggle for existence throughout the period. In 1867 it cared for eighteen children, in 1869 the number was twenty-eight. Pastor

---

Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 79, and Bericht...Untersuchung, 79-80. A reference to the conditions which the Gesellschaft wished to have established is to be found in a statement on information which it requested, K. B. XIII, 18, 142.

[73] K. B. XIII, 23, 181-4. Income for the last six months was reported as $550, of which $221 was credited to two special offerings. The festival offering was $189 which was probably in addition to the total given. No mention is made of receipts from the regular synodical offering, which may not have been in at the time. Five children paid $66. There was income from the farm in the form of supplies for part of the year and there were also some gifts in kind. The next year the festival offering brought nearly $300, XIV, 21, 164-6.

[74] K. B. XXI, 18, 143-4; XXII, 21, 163. The debt in 1878 was $500, but a deficit of $150 increased it to $650. Bad weather on the festival day reduced the offering to less than $150 and may have caused the deficit, since it usually ran $300-$400. In the next year it brought $555 and the debt was reduced by $350. Salaries were reported as $700 in 1878. The figures given in the last two footnotes differ slightly from those in Poppen, Goldenes Jubilaeum, 29. The average annual income aside from festival collections for the decade of the seventies was $2,316 against $1,161 during the preceding decade. Beginning in 1869 the annual income rose to $2,000 or more and ran below that figure only in 1877 and 1880, rising well above $3,000 in 1875.

Schueller, who continued to serve as superintendent as well as Pastor of Andrew until 1873, from time to time solicited needed funds. He too went beyond the boundaries of the synod, in a period of friendly intersynodical relations in the late sixties apparently with some success, in congregations of the Wisconsin and even of the Missouri Synod. In 1868 he was dealing with a project for enlisting regular support from the latter body, which, however, came to nothing.[75] Financial support was so precarious that Schueller found it failing, whenever he returned to direct the orphanage.[76] In 1871 the orphanage projected a paper, *Blaetter aus* dem Waisenhause, to present its cause, and the convention of that year gave its approval to the project.[77]

---

[75] The visitation report for Andrew already cited gives the number for 1869, the earlier number is in a letter, Rembold - Grossmann, Andrew, November 13, 1867, in I. S. D. Rembold was assistant in charge of the orphanage then, so that Schueller could travel as described. Only three of the children were of German origin, but Rembold wished to try to make all of them as German as possible. Another letter, Schueller - Grossmann, Andrew, February 3, 1868, mentions the Missouri project, though not in definite terms. On Klindworth's advice Schueller had discussed it with a pastor Beier (sic) and come to agreement. The latter would seek approbation of his synod and Schueller was now submitting the plan to Grossmann. No reply from Grossmann is extant. Two years later a warning, signed Joh. P. Beyer, appeared *Lutheraner*, XXXI, 21, 167-8, against an orphanage at Andrew, sometime called Iowa's, sometimes Schueller's private venture, sometimes stated to be likely to make common cause with Wisconsin and Missouri, whose representatives had been begging pertinaciously and exploiting many Missouri members. Since Scriptures forbade association with heretics, the writer would not let them into his house.

[76] A letter, Schueller - Grossmann, Andrew, March 1, 1871, in I. S. D., makes this statement while again applying for an assistant. He had then been at the orphanage for some time, but would have to go out soon.

The orphanage carried a heavy debt, which no doubt was in large part due to the cost of acquiring its property. Apparently as the number of children increased a second building was erected, which increased the burden.[78] In 1872 the debt amounted to $5,000 and Schueller went to Des Moines to make a personal appeal for a loan from the state legislature on the ground that the orphanage was caring for civil war orphans. He was successful, the legislature made a loan of $5,000 for ten years without interest.[79] The relief seems to have been purely temporary. A few years later, new debts had accumulated to the amount of $12,000. Late in the period heroic endeavors succeeded in reducing it to $5,000, but this debt continued to stand against the orphanage in addition to that owed to the state and the burden remained heavy.[80]

---

[77] K.B. XIV, 23, 207. This paper later served both orphanages and the latter part of the title was changed to aus den Waisenhaeusern, Chronik, 98. Doubtless complete files would be a good source of information, but the writer has seen only a few copies.

[78] The writer has found no indication as to when or why this building was constructed, It was described in connection with the origin of the teachers' seminary as frame, three story, 36 x 30, in K. B. XXI, 23, 174. A letter, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, November 9, 1873, refers to closing one building for the sake of economy and implies that it had been there for some time. Since the building erected in 1864 was said to afford room for seventy-five children and personnel, it is not clear why another was erected. Possibly the frame structure may have been on the property when it was purchased, but that does not seem likely.

[79] Festschrift 1863-1913, 7-8. The state cancelled this debt in 1896. State senators were instrumental in securing action on both occasions.

The orphanage was almost ruined when Pastor Schueller was exposed as having become involved in grave delinquencies in 1873.[81] Hoping to avoid a public scandal Klindworth, to whom Schueller had made a confession, and who was prominent in orphanage affairs, immediately arranged for his replacement with Rembold and advised Schueller to leave for Germany.[82]

---

[80] Ibid., 8. Dates are not given. The debt was incurred and reduced while Pastor J. Rembold was superintendent, 1873-1887. It is possible that it was incurred during the hard times of the seventies and reduced in the eighties.

[81] Schueller, whose wife had died a few years earlier, seduced several young girls in the orphanage. A letter, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, August 15, 1873, in I. S. D., gives the facts as Schueller confessed them and asks that the letter be destroyed. The Dubuque Herald, August 19, 1873, brings details.

[82] Klindworth was editor of the paper and had been on the board of the society since its beginning. The affair was related by a girl to the matron, who confronted Schueller with her story according to the Dubuque Herald. Schueller then went to Klindworth, who according to the cited letter was stunned and crushed by the revelation. According to another letter, Grossmann - Direktorium Andrew, St. Sebald, August 2, 1873, (the day is obviously wrong) in I. S. D., confessional secrecy played a part in Klindworth's decision. He advised Schueller to go to Neuendettelsau, confess to Bauer and await events. The two then went to see Rembold, induced him to accept the position and his congregation to release him. They next returned to Andrew, acquainted local board members with the facts and agreed with them to carry through the plan. Klindworth wrote that he was trying to avert shame from the church and vast damage from the orphanage and to spare Schueller. Grossmann was informed of the changes in a letter, Rembold - Grossmann, Bellevue, July 31, 1873, with a long

The secret was kept long enough to permit Schueller to depart, but a few days later it leaked out. A newspaper published an account which was widely copied and became generally known in the congregations.[83] Klindworth's action had placed the synod in the position of shielding a criminal from justice and strong reactions occurred. Grossmann requested the orphanage board to induce Schueller to return and surrender and the Kirchenblatt published an article admitting the facts, disapproving Schueller's flight and giving notice of Grossmann's action.[84] Schueller had in the meantime reached Neuendettelsau,

---

postscript by Klindworth. The reason for the changes was not given, though the urgency of immediate action was stressed and Grossmann was told that Schueller would leave by August 5, while the Dubuque Herald reported that he left on the 11th. Grossmann in his inaccessible location, though his suspicions might be aroused, was thus hardly given time to take action. Deindoerfer felt that he should have been informed in person immediately after the Andrew arrangements had been made.

[83] Klindworth's cited letter on August 15 indicates that the teacher (female and American) spread the story, which on August 14 resulted in a local investigation. Only then did he give Grossmann the facts. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, August 10, 1873, in I. S. D., had already asked for them, word of Schueller's voyage having spread. In another letter, Burkhard - Deindoerfer, Hull's Prairie, September 2, 1873, in I. S. D. which Deindoerfer sent on to Grossmann with a postscript, he refers to the Dubuque Herald story. Several other letters indicate that it became generally known.

[84] The cited, misdated letter from Grossmann asked the Andrew board to take this action for Schueller's and their own sake, as well as that of the synod and the church, K. B. XVI, 18, 143, brings the published story and appeals to Schueller, should he see it, to return. A letter, Luz - Grossmann, September 23, 1873, in I. S. D., reports much local disturbance, people could not stomach it that a criminal had been aided to escape, but the published report had helped soothe indignation. Letters, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, October 4; November 8, 1873, in I. S. D., while pitying Schueller, are critical of Klindworth's conduct and of an account which he published in the orphanage paper, which the writer has not seen. They also criticize

but he did not respond to the appeal to return and surrender to the authorities. When news of the uproar reached him, he left his refuge and vanished utterly.[85]

A bad business thus had been badly mishandled by the orphanage authorities. The desire to avoid a scandal had only made it worse. While it can be understood that Klindworth shrank from a sensational trial, the widespread impression that an attempt had been made to hush up a crime involving the cloth and the fact that in the process the escape of a criminal had been facilitated was worse and was bound to react unfavorably on the good name of the synod and on the support of the orphanage.[86] There are indications that offerings fell

---

the Kirchenblatt account for lack of moral indignation, feel that Schueller should have been unfrocked and should yet be. People even yet were critical that the synod did not take offenses of pastors seriously.

[85] A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, February 14, 1872, (the year date is obviously wrong) in I. S. D., relays this information from Germany. Schueller fled when the appeal reached him. A rumor of suicide had spread. Deindoerfer was still compassionate, but urged the striking of Schueller's name from the clerical roster.

[86] The letter just cited is sharply critical of Klindworth's handling of the affair and holds that Grossmann should have been informed in person as noted in footnote 82, Klindworth facilitated escape under false pretenses. In earlier letters Deindoerfer referred to shame and disgrace. It should be noted that Missouri's Lutheraner did not mention this affair, even though the Kirchenblatt had been less reticent when only a little earlier a member of the theological faculty at St. Louis had embraced Catholicism. As to the orphanage the Kirchenblatt report on this matter had urged congregations not to let the orphanage suffer for the sin of its head and had requested those who had passed the offering in mid-summer to take it up. The cited letter from Luz mentioned a woman who had left the congregation over this affair. A letter,

off and it seems probable that the debt situation which has been described may have been a result of impaired confidence. A plan was considered to place the orphanage under the society which had been formed in the east in 1870, but it was not carried out.[87] The Andrew society was then reorganized and some economies effected and under Rembold's direction the difficult task of regaining confidence and support was undertaken.[88] The orphanage then had twenty-five children and the

---

Rembold - Grossmann, September 1, 1873, in I. S. D. mentioned much local disturbance.

[87] It may be that extension of the society into the west had been planned from the beginning and that it had earlier negotiated with Andrew on this point. See a letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, May 15, 1872, in I. S. D., which regretfully accepts its confinement to the east. In this instance the suggestion came from Andrew, but it is not clear just what it involved, no transfer of children is mentioned, Toledo could hardly have handled them in any case. The debt was a stumbling block. Andrew seems to have proposed that the society take it over and in return receive the entire synodical offering for orphans. Deindoerfer apparently made a counterproposal that the Andrew Society retain the debt. The eastern board refused to take over Andrew. Deindoerfer resented the action and resigned his presidency in consequence. Letters, Klindworth - Grossmann, October 22, 1873; Deindoerfer - Grossmann, October 4; 15, 1873, in I. S. D.

[88] A letter, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, November 9, 1873, reports that annual elections of directors were established and a new society beginning with the old members as a nucleus was to be formed. A combination of membership dues and of offerings was to finance the institution and it was hoped that a surplus would result which could reduce debts. The letter mentions a good harvest, which yielded nearly enough provisions for a year. One building was closed down.

number remained fairly constant for the next few years.[89] In 1875 Klindworth's support was lost in consequence of the crisis of that year.[90] The pressure of hard times and debts was felt heavily, but the work was carried on and the effects of the crisis were gradually overcome.[91]

Though the synod had grown considerably it was not yet at the end of its first quarter century able to conduct all the enterprises for which it saw needs. The Kirchenblatt had become both well established and well adapted to the purpose it served. Its circulation, however, still left much to be desired. The new Kirchliche Zeitschrift was serving its purpose successfully. While a printery was again in existence, it was not adequate and could not handle the publications, particularly of school books, for which there was need and demand. The book store after a fair beginning had declined.

---

[89] Ibid., reports twenty-five children in 1873. A letter, Rembold - Grossmann, April 16, 1875, indicates that there were then twenty-four and that two more would soon be admitted.

[90] A letter, Rembold - --, Andrew, October 14, 1875, reports that Klindworth had been removed as president of the society and as editor and that in consequence he wished to retire entirely.

[91] The two letters of Rembold last cited refer to hard times in 1875. The first writes of a cold winter, in which provisions froze and expresses worry over lack of supplies. Mrs. Rembold at that time was handling the home and the children alone. The next letter mentions that the summer too had been hard and complains of debts. Both letters and also Klindworth's are in I. S. D.

On the charitable side the synod was making some provision for those who had claims upon it, but the problem was growing and support was not yet adequate. The western orphanage remained in a precarious situation, while the Toledo institution had been placed upon a sound footing. It seems clear that the great efforts which had to be made to maintain an educational system, were causing a relative neglect of charitable functions.

CHAPTER XVI

REORGANIZATION: CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT 1864-1879

The adoption in 1864 of the first synodical constitution marked the abandonment of the old conception, already considerably modified during the first decade, that church government was properly the function of the ministerium.[1] A new constitutional era ensued, as the constitution of 1864 came into effect, in which elected synodical officers were entrusted with defined functions in the sphere of administration, while synodical conventions, consisting of all clergymen and of representatives of congregations which held membership, exercised legislative control. From the viewpoint of constitutional theory the new system proved satisfactory and was to become permanent. The specific provisions of the new constitution, however, did not prove efficient in every respect, particularly when rapid expansion, numerical and territorial, had a tendency to increase administrative duties. Constitutional development therefore moved in the direction of reorganization.

---

[1] Deindoerfer, Denkschrift 10, 18-19, summarizes the developments of the first decade. Written in 1864, it did not consider the new constitution, which had not been adopted at the time of writing. The writer states that in the early years the synod inclined toward episcopal theories of church government. Practical experience, and study of constitutional tendencies and controversies in the Lutheran Church of America had led many members to conclude that the

The general ministerial conference, which had played so large a part during the first decade, had been stripped of church governmental functions and soon ceased to exist. One such meeting was held in 1865, but it was simply a pastoral conference on a general scale. While universal meetings of the clergy might be desirable from time to time, it was difficult to secure general attendance. No doubt this factor led to the abandonment of general conferences.[2] The local conferences on the other hand remained vigorous and since controversial subjects were frequently referred to them for study they assumed the functions which general pastoral conferences might have had, if it had been practical to hold them. The six older conferences continued to exist and as the synod grew, the number increased to ten, divisions taking place in the east and in northern Iowa, while a separate conference was formed in central Illinois, and another in Nebraska.[3]

---

theory according to which church government was derived from the office of the ministry was wrong and unlutheran.

[2] The conference of 1865 met at Altenburg, Missouri. No attendance data were found, but it is highly improbable that all pastors could attend a meeting at so remote a point. It discussed practical questions and a theological paper, Chronik, 78. Another general session attended by members of several conferences was held in 1866 at MacGregor, Iowa, Chronik, 79. It will be recalled that in connection with the invitation to Bauer to come to America in 1870, larger pastoral conferences were projected. That several were envisaged was no doubt due to the difficulty of securing general attendance at one meeting. Since Bauer did not come, the conferences were probably not held.

[3] It cannot be stated just when these conferences were organized. The Nebraska conference was mentioned in the presidential report to the convention of 1871, which gave a total

Conferences had not exercised functions of church government for some time past, and unlike the latter part of the first decade, there was little complaint about their trying to assume them or interfere in them. During the time, however, when districts were in process of formation, the Eastern Conference was by degrees transformed into a district and thus became involved in church governmental affairs. Other conferences also were affected to some degree and the proposal was submitted, that the conferences be given governmental duties. During this process regional pastoral conferences, involving the members of two local conferences were also authorized and held occasionally. The final solution which established districts and district conventions, left the local conferences, what they had already become, study groups without governmental functions. They could still exercise influence, however, when they studied controversial subjects which might be referred to them and made recommendations on them.[4] There

---

of seven conferences, K. B. XIV, 13, 98. In 1873 mention occurs of two northern Iowa conferences and of a Mendota conference, XVI, 18, 139. It is also possible that southern Illinois and Missouri formerly one conference had been separated into two, Ibid. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, May 9, 1873, suggests that the Eastern Conference be divided into Ohio and Michigan conferences, but states that nothing had as yet been done.

[4] It has seemed best to make a reference to these developments at this point for the sake of completeness and clarity, lest later references seem contradictory. Details and documentation can best be given in connection with the emergence of districts. Subjects referred to conferences which required legislative action subsequently were the constitution for congregations and that for the Pfarrwitwenkasse.

is some evidence that conferences began during the period to hold their meetings less frequently than during the first decade. Complaints about non-attendance and inferior work were also voiced occasionally. In regard to the former complaint the convention of 1871 established a disciplinary procedure.[5]

The constitution of 1864 placed a rather heavy burden on the president. He was to make the necessary preparations for synodical conventions, name floor committees and preside

---

At that time the districts did not yet exist. After they had come into being, district conventions were more likely to refer matters to conferences than was the general convention.

[5] Conference minutes for the period do not seem to be extant and it is therefore difficult to give exact information. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, May 9, 1873, in I. S. D., reporting on the writer's activities as district president, mentions that the Eastern Conference had dropped its winter meeting and now held only three meetings during the year. The burden of work and travel difficulties were given as the reason, and it was stated that attendance had improved in consequence. It was in this connection that Deindoerfer advocated division of the conference. He also wrote that work assigned was not always done and found this excusable because of teaching duties of the pastors. He added, however, that it was inexcusable that not all pastors tried to make the conference worth while. The president, reporting on conferences to the convention of 1871, mentioned both irregular attendance and chronic absenteeism in several instances and added that some absentees would not send excuses or respond to inquiries. He held such an attitude to be intolerable and recommended that the new constitution should have provisions dealing with it. This suggestion went unheeded, but a resolution was passed, providing for admonition first by the conference and then by the president. If neither brought results the absentee should be reported at the next convention, which was to expel him, unless his conduct could be justified, K. B. XIV, 13, 99; 21, 162.

at the meetings, also to supervise execution of all resolutions and report on them and he was given the right to call special sessions. He was also to represent the synod over against pastors and congregations in all respects, subject to appeal to a convention. This involved all vocations, ordinations, installations, though the latter two functions might be delegated. Also he was to conduct visitations in all congregations and educational institutions within the period designated by each convention. He was to investigate all complaints against pastors and congregations and reach decisions, with the right of expulsion. Applications of pastors and congregations for admission and dismissal were also to be granted by him and he was to sign and seal all documents which went out in the name of the synod. Administration of the seminary and of the Indian mission were placed in the hands of committees, but the latter was to consult with the president and he was chairman of the former and bound to report to the synod on its behalf and was also chairman of the examination committee.[6]

---

[6] Constitution of 1864, Articles VI, VII, VIII, most conveniently found in Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 91, 92. There were also committees on schools and on publications of which the president was made a member in 1864. His advisory committee consisted of the two theological professors and Deindoerfer. When Deindoerfer went to the east late in 1864 it became difficult for this committee to meet and there are no records indicating that it was active. No doubt Grossmann was in constant consultation with the staff at Wartburg and he carried on an extensive correspondence with Deindoerfer, but while he might delegate some specific tasks, the responsibility rested on him. In strong contrast to presidential burdens, other officers had few duties.

The president upon whom all these duties were imposed was not a full-time officer, but he remained pastor of a congregation and for a number of years was co-editor of the Kirchenblatt. Under these conditions it is not surprising that administration was not very efficient. Synodical resolutions often were not carried out,[7] there were irregularities in call procedures,[8] the president could not travel freely, particularly in the remoter areas to maintain contacts and esprit de corps.[9] It would be idle to blame an overburdened president who wore out his health in the service of the synod for these deficiencies. A system which required the services of a full-time president at a time when such an arrangement was not possible, was at fault. The results, however, undeniably were disquieting. The synod lacked cohesion, its laity did not acquire a strong sense of synodical consciousness or a sense of reponsibility for synodical undertakings. Its clergy contained men who were thoroughly loyal and others who were not, while many loyal enough in theory were indifferent in practice and others in time became discouraged to the point of breaking with the synod.[10]

---

[7] For an example see Zusammenstellung 1867 in the copy annotated for enforcement in I. S. D. While some resolutions were carried out, others were not and on some points the president did not know whether anything had been done or not. It seems to have been quite common that resolutions were passed and forgotten or that enforcement ceased after sporadic endeavors had been tried. Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 84-85, quotes a statement by Hoerlein that the entire history of the synod was a record of violated synodical resolutions. This pamphlet often skirts this subject, but does not make the most of an important point, because it seeks to blame individuals rather than a system.

[8] See the discussion in chapter XIV on this point.

[9] Grossmann himself brought out this point at the convention of 1868, K. B. XI, 22, 174. His correspondence often contains requests to come and look into situations and often later letters indicate that he had not been able to come.

A revision of the constitution of 1864 became necessary in order to provide greater efficiency, but it took a number of years to bring the synod to a realization of this necessity. In the meantime some steps were taken to relieve the burden on the president. The secretary voluntarily took over parochial reports and statistics.[11] The convention of 1867 authorized the president to delegate visitations to the vice-president and other pastors.[12] Abandonment of the Indian mission removed another responsibility and for a number of years he also ceased to be co-editor of the *Kirchenblatt*. An assistant was provided at St. Sebald, who seems to have taken over the major portion of the pastoral work,[13] without, however, leaving Grossmann free from pastoral responsibilities.

---

[10] Evidence of lack of loyalty would seem to lie in the relatively large number of withdrawals during the period. The convention of 1871 expressed disapproval of withdrawals for material reasons, cloaked by a pretense of doctrinal differences, K. B. XIV, 21, 162. A specific case was given in the president's report, 14, 105. Indifference would seem to be revealed in the numerous complaints about failure to lift offerings regularly. Klindworth clearly was a loyal and energetic pastor who became discouraged, although as will be shown, his own activities in regard to constitutional change, tended to retard vital innovations.

[11] This point has already been noted in chapter XIV, see footnote 1. The president carried this function over from the first decade, probably because it had not been included under the fixed duties of the secretary in the constitution of 1864 and under his general responsibility for the execution of synodical resolutions. The inefficiency of an overburdened executive is revealed by the failure to provide printed blanks as required by a resolution in 1867 during the next year. Lack of forms in part was responsible, no doubt, for remissness of many pastors in making reports and this in turn carried over, even after forms were provided. In consequence it was necessary in 1873 to set up a committee to deal with pastors who did not make statistical reports, Beschluesse 1873 in I. S. D. Since most statistical reports for the period are not extant, no general statement can safely

---

be made, but regularity of the parochial reports seems to have improved under the secretary's administration. For 1872, seventy-four out of ninety-two parishes, some of which may have been vacant made reports, *K. B.* XVI, 24, 178-9. The resolution of 1873 may indicate that there were chronic offenders. Later in the period both districts dealt with the matter. In 1877 the Western District asked the visitors to check on parochial reports, *K. B.* XX, 23, 178; in 1878 the Eastern District provided that pastors who failed to send them should be called to account at the convention, XXI, 16, 127.

[12] *Zusammenstellung* 1867 in I. S. D.

[13] The relationship of Grossmann to the pastorate at St. Sebald is not easy to understand. The rejection of the request of the congregation in 1867 that Grossmann be relieved of the presidency, so that he could teach parochial school and the appropriation of a sum toward a teacher's salary, *Zusammenstellung* 1867 in I. S. D., have been noted. Perhaps because no teacher was available, Pastor J. Baumbach on his arrival from Germany during the next year, became Grossmann's assistant. In 1869 Grossmann wrote the parochial report for St. Sebald in which he noted that the salary had been paid in part to Baumbach and in part to the two Fritschels. He himself had received none, but he noted, "aber doch *viel* Arbeit in der Gemeinde," *Parochialbericht*, *St*. *Sebald*, *1869*, in I. S. D. Housing is not mentioned, perhaps he considered his use of the parsonage adequate compensation for his work, at any rate the writing of the report would indicate that he still considered himself pastor. Baumbach also relieved him of the music instruction at the seminary, but Grossmann gave the catechetical course introduced in that year and later took over the music again also, *K. B.* XVI, 19, 145. In 1871 he seems to have considered giving up the congregation and taking a *Filiale*. Deindoerfer advised him against this, because it would increase his inaccessibility and also did not think that he should take another parish, for then he would not have

The Eastern Conference in 1868 proposed a more thoroughgoing measure. Calling attention to the need of its congregations for better supervision than they could possibly get when the president was so far away and travel so costly, it proposed transformation of the conference into an Eastern District. In this way the needs of the congregations could be met and the president could be relieved, while unity need not be broken. Perhaps fearful of being accused of separatist tendencies, it confined itself to submitting the request and did not present a specific plan.[14] The convention of that year

---

substitutes from the seminary available. A position at the college or the seminary would be preferable, for his absences then would not bring the entire work to a standstill, but would not be really satisfactory either. See a letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, January 31, 1871, in I. S. D. Grossmann did not leave St. Sebald until he went to Mendota in 1874. He may have taught his courses at the seminary there, but he did not again take a congregation. Financial reports to the convention of 1875 gave an amount of $886 as paid from the Synodalkasse as president's salary, including travel and other items, since 1873. It may be that the convention of the latter year arranged for a salaried presidency, though the writer has not found a resolution to that effect. In connection with the foundation of the teachers' seminary, it was stated that the salary was $300 annually, which provision was made in 1877 by joint action of the two district conventions, K. B. XXI, 17, 131.

[14] K. B.XI, 22, 173. While the conference emphasized the difficulty of presidential supervision from a distance, especially when the situation required immediate decisions, it stated expressly that it was not casting aspersions on the president, it was merely stating impossibilities. The arrangement, if granted, should be so devised as to maintain concord and communion and a desire to separate from the synod was expressly disavowed. It was perhaps because there had been suspicions on this account in the past that it wished to leave arrangements to the synod and asked it to form the district and determine relationships as it deemed best.

agreed to the proposal, but put off action to the next convention, asking both the Eastern and the Galena Conferences to work out projects for the purpose. Provisionally the Eastern Conference was authorized to confer the presidential duties on a pastor of its own choice in the meantime.[15] The convention also discussed the advisability of creating a separate southern district, a project strongly supported by Grossmann, but the pastors present from that area were not enthusiastic and no action was taken.[16]

When the next convention met in 1869 the two conferences submitted the projects which they had been instructed to prepare in 1868. The two plans differed radically, however. The Eastern Conference proposed that the synod be divided into several district synods, each with its own convention and officers. To these district synods was to be transferred all business concerning vacancies and calls, visitations, reception into membership. The Galena draft on the other hand proposed synodical districts headed by vice-presidents, who were to conduct visitations and investigations, but not to attend to calls and vacancies. The districts were not to hold conventions, but regional pastoral conferences which the general president was to attend.[17] An extended debate ensued, in which the matter of calls was the core of the discussion. The majority felt that the eastern proposal would lead to confusion, unified handling through the synodical president would preserve order and peace.[18] In the end the Galena draft was adopted with some changes. Four districts were to be created, each headed by a vice-president.[19] These were to investigate all difficulties and reach decisions in the first instance, to visit all congregations within two-year periods and to conduct all ordinations and installations, in both cases as also for visitations they might appoint representatives to take their place. Calls were expressly reserved for the synodical president and conventions forbidden.[20] The synodical president was to check on visitations at pastoral conferences and to hear and decide appeals from vice-presidential decisions in investigations.[21]

---

[15] *Ibid*. A floor committee brought in favorable recommendations and the matter was discussed at length. No opposition was noted. The choice of the eastern pastors was not given, but to judge from a letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Toledo, May 28, 1869, in I. S. D., Deindoerfer was performing presidential duties. In another letter on February 6, 1869, *Ibid*., also to Grossmann, Deindoerfer noted and rejected renewed western suspicions of eastern separatism.

[16] *K*. *B*. XI, 22, 173-4. Grossmann emphasized the need of frequent visits and declared that he could not often go south and also stressed difficulties about pastoral calls. He proposed division on a Mendota-Galena line, to form approximately equal districts in the west, both a little stronger than the Eastern District. This division may account for some of the opposition, reasons were not specifically stated.

---

[17] *K*. *B*. XII, 22, 169. Copies of the two drafts are not extant, but the Galena draft in the form in which it was adopted by the convention is printed, Deindoerfer, *Geschichte*, 168-9. *Chronik*, 91, gives no details but says that the Galena draft intended to preserve synodical unity, which was thought endangered by the eastern proposal.

[18] *K*. *B*. XII, 22, 169. There were those who would have preferred to reserve visitations for the president also. The problem was relief for him until he could be made a full-time officer. This was to be achieved by transferring ordinations, installations, visitations and investigations to the vice-presidents. There were also those who conceded that district synods would in time become necessary, but did not think that the time had arrived.

[19] District 1 was to contain Ohio, Michigan and adjoining states, 2 Iowa and Minnesota, 3 central and northern Illinois and Wisconsin, 4 southern Illinois, Missouri and Nebraska. Pastors present from the respective areas were to choose the vice-presidents at the conventions. Too few pastors were present from the east to make a choice, but Deindoerfer functioned there. The second district elected S. Fritschel, the third, Klindworth, the fourth, Koeberle, *Ibid*., 170-1.

Although these measures reduced the presidential burden, they represent a step backward from the decision of 1868 to confer full presidential powers on an eastern pastor. They constitute a modification of a system whose inefficiency had been challenged, but not a new system. The complaint, that transfers of pastors and calls to vacancies in distant parishes were subject to vexatious and injurious delays was not met. The **Ea**stern District in consequence was disappointed.[22] The synodical districts were to function for four years. The vice-presidents appear to have discharged their duties and district pastoral conferences met though little can be learned of their character.[23] The east, however, continued to press for the right to hold a district convention and boundaries of the other districts proved to be unsatisfactory. At the

---

[20] A joint pastoral conference for each district, to be attended by the president was to be held in years when no general convention met, Ibid.

[21] In cases of applications of pastors for membership, the president was to report to the vice-president of the district of their residence and to order a colloquy, Ibid. Power to admit both congregations and pastors remained with the president, but in the case of pastors the next convention in 1871 restricted this to provisional admission to be reported to the next convention for confirmation, K. B. XIV, 21, 162.

[22] Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 169-70, recalls that the arrangement was hardly conducive toward preserving a spirit of unity in the east, that instead it fostered a sense of grievance. The east had particularly desired power to act in matters of calls, because of complications resulting from delays, when approval had to be got from a great distance.

It had also desired the right to hold its own conventions, in order to draw congregations which rarely sent delegates to western meetings into participation in synodical affairs at home. The convention met at Galena, where most of the adherents of that plan could readily attend. Only three eastern pastors were present, even Deindoerfer was absent. While eastern pastors generally were only sparsely represented, in this instance conventions had been held in three successive years and attendance was generally poor, with thirty-seven pastors present and thirty-five absent, *K. B.* XII, 18, 140-1. Undoubtedly the poor eastern representation made an effective presentation of the eastern plan difficult, Deindoerfer holds Klindworth chiefly responsible for enactment of the Galena project.

[23] *Bericht...Koeberle...May 25, 1871*, in I. S. D., comments on most of the congregations in the fourth district, though only a number of them had been visited informally and no regular visitations seem to have been conducted. He also carried on a heavy correspondence and tried to become thoroughly familiar with conditions. Missions in western Missouri and Kansas were recommended as was separation of Nebraska, which Koeberle had not been able to visit. This is the only formal report on the period 1868-1871 in I. S. D., but Klindworth letters from the period indicate that he made suggestions even in regard to calls and transfers and Deindoerfer letters complain of the burden of travel and of illness and stress need for assistance if duties were not to be neglected at home. No indication of the work of S. Fritschel is extant, undoubtedly he was in oral consultation with Grossmann. Grossmann reported in 1871 that all districts had held pastoral conferences and that he had visited all but one of which he was notified too late, but gave no hint of what they did. Attendance was good in all but one, *K. B.* XIV, 13, 98. He had still conducted twenty-four visitations and reported fifteen more in 1873, XVI, 18, 132, plus about as many visits. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, May 9, 1873, reports on this period.

convention of 1871 the synod declared itself ready to divide itself into two district synods, but put the making of a definite arrangement off to the next convention once more and for the interim rather radically changed the boundaries of the three western districts.[24]

The changes made in 1869 had, of course, altered the synodical constitution, though no formal amendment seems to have been enacted.[25] Further changes as envisaged in 1871, however, clearly raised the question of a revision of the constitution. Klindworth had in fact at that time submitted a revised draft, based, as he put it, on the monarchical rather than the democratic principle, and designed to define sharply the spheres of obligation and of liberty, so that the church government would have definite authority and so that pastors would know definitely what their duties as members of the synod were and what position they were to take.[26] No action by the convention of 1871 on this draft is recorded, but when the synod met again in 1873, in the west after all, it was on the agenda, together with constitutional proposals submitted by the Eastern Conference and perhaps a draft on district synods by Grossmann.[27]

---

[24] *Chronik*, 91, indicates that the system never worked very well, mentioning difficulties about calls particularly. At the convention of 1871 the eastern need of conventions for the benefit of its laity was the major reason for the reversal so far as records indicate and *Chronik*, 93, confirms this. The decision was put off, because again few eastern pastors were present (3, Deindoerfer also absent again with a total of forty-seven present, thirty-four absent, *K*. *B*. XIV, 18, 148-9), and they uninstructed. The next synod was to be held in the east and Deindoerfer was to work out a draft on relations between the districts and between them and the synod in good time so that it could be submitted to the conferences before the next convention. In the west there was to be a northern district including the northern Iowa, Galena and Wisconsin conferences; a central district with central and southern Iowa and central Illinois; and a southern district with Missouri, southern Illinois and Tennessee. Nebraska was to be directly under the general president. The vice-presidents were again to visit all congregations, using substitutes when they could not do so and the election, conducted in the same manner as in 1869, was to be confirmed by the convention. The northerndistrict elected Klindworth, the central Strobel, the southern Koeberle, *K*. *B*. XIV, 19, 149-50.

[25] The constitution of 1864 had no amending clause.

---

[26] The writer has found no draft of this revision. Letters, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, March 1; May 3, 1871, in I. S. D., give this description. It is evident that Klindworth was striving for efficiency and for development of a firm synodical consciousness. He writes of common action and cooperation. There is no hint, however, whether he was now ready to accept district synods. He wished the constitution to be printed and placed in the hands of pastors, particularly those newly admitted to membership, so that they would know clearly where they stood.

[27] K. B. XIV, 23, 207, reports that the constitution was to be printed and that conferences might bring changes or additions before the convention of 1873, but does not mention Klindworth's draft. In view of the decision reached on district synods, it is likely that consideration was deferred. The announcement of the convention of 1873 placed division into districts and constitutional revision first on the agenda, K. B. XVI, 11, 81. The president's report stated that Deindoerfer could not work out the draft assigned to him because of illness and that the extraordinary committee which met at Wartburg in the summer of 1872 had transferred this task to Grossmann. He had submitted his draft to the vice-

On the basis of these drafts the convention of 1873 modified the constitution so thoroughly that the result may be called a new constitution, although aside from the changes necessitated by the acceptance of district synods, the older provisions were elaborated rather than eliminated. Adoption, however, was only provisional, both conferences and districts were to study the provisions and make their recommendations to the next convention when final adoption was to take place.[28] The first three sections dealt with confessional position, membership, admissions and dismissals and were taken over from the former constitution with few changes.[29] Section IV was

---

presidents, which probably meant that it was to be studied by regional rather than by local conferences. Whether they did so was not reported, though such a conference attended by most of the eastern pastors was mentioned. It may be that the draft came too late for such consideration. Local conferences could probably have been substituted, but Grossmann had a report from only one such conference. His report made no further mention of his draft and the agenda listed in it, did not give it, though Klindworth's draft was mentioned, K. B. XVI, 14, 106; 17, 130. For the eastern resolutions see the letter, Oestliche Pastoralconferenz - Praesidium, May 3, 1873, in I. S. D. The convention met at Davenport, the general eastern conference already mentioned had agreed to the change, because eastern pastors could get reduced fares to Chicago and had hopes of getting them beyond, which did not materialize, while western pastors could get them only to Chicago and many said they could not go. The Chicago-Toledo run is about fifty miles longer than that Chicago-Davenport. Of fifty-eight pastors present, ten and of forty-two absent, twelve were from the east, K. B. XVI, 17, 129-30.

[28] Chronik, 105-9, and K. B. XVI, 18, 137-9, which states that the constitution was based on a draft submitted, but does not say whose. A floor committee had revised it, Beschluesse 1873 in I. S. D. Both give the text which is also printed, Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 170-5. It was also ordered printed in 1873 by the K. B. account, but the writer has not seen a copy of this edition.

[29] One of these changes, however, was in the confessional paragraph and was to become highly controversial, for this

new and provided for division into a comparatively small eastern and a rather large western district and for their further division into visitation districts. Section V on functions of the synod and district synods retained all the provisions of the former Section IV but added supervision over purity of doctrine, confessional practice and discipline. Districts were to deal with matters which concerned them solely, while the synod was to take charge of matters which concerned the entirety and both were to hold their own conventions and elect their own officers.[30] Section VI dealt with conventions. The general convention was to meet at four year intervals and there was no provision for special sessions, districts were to meet at least twice in every four-year period. District resolutions to which the general president objected in the interest of the synod were to be submitted to the next

---

reason it will be discussed in the next chapter. Also in the confessional section a second change specifically mentioned secret societies among rejected activities. In paragraph 10 congregational constitutions were required to conform to synodical principles, rather than to its model. Paragraph 12 was new and provided for unfrocking and discharging clergymen who gave offense and did not respond to discipline. It was not inspired by the Andrew case which occurred a few weeks later.

[30] No district functions were specified, the synod was to have charge of such things as educational institutions, synodical property, membership by synod in federations, etc. Supervision over districts was also specified.

general convention, before they could be put into effect.[31] Section VII retained the existing synodical offices and included that of the editor of the Kirchenblatt, also trustees, electoral and examination committees for the institutions and created a new executive committee or Ausschuss and defined their functions.[32] Each district was to elect a president, a vice-president and a secretary, whose duties were also defined.[33] Each visitation district was to have its own visitor, who was to visit all congregations within three years.[34] The section on conferences in the old constitution was not included and there was no provision for amendment.

---

[31] Both conventions might deal with timely questions of doctrine and church life. They were to receive reports from all officers and district presidents were to report to both. Schoolbooks, hymnals, etc., were in the sphere of the general convention. Decisions of district presidents in investigations could be appealed to the district and the general convention was the final instance. Both were to elect their officers by ballot.

[32] The president kept his former duties in regard to conventions and was to have doctrinal discussions announced six weeks previous to their meetings in the Kirchenblatt. He also remained responsible for execution of synodical resolutions and signature of official papers. Beynod this he was only to hold annual visitations of the educational institutions and to supervise them generally and was directed to attend all district conventions. The secretary kept his former duties inclusive of parochial reports, but the treasurer was to receive and administer all synodical moneys and report to the convention. Duties of the trustees were not defined. Personnel of the examination and electoral committees was specified and the functions of the former elaborated. The editor was required to conform to synodical regulations and principles. The Ausschuss was to consist of the three presidents and two elected members, one a theological professor. It was to meet at the call of the president with consent of two members or at the request of the majority and regularly a few days before conventions for preliminary consideration of synodical business. If urgent matters occurred which could not be postponed to a convention, it was to decide and report later and might at its option call on district synods for opinions.

In sum total the changes were rather extensive and far-reaching. Not only were districts created and district conventions authorized, but the long interval between general conventions would tend to enhance their importance. In another connection it has already been noted, that the failure to provide for special synodical conventions could cause disturbance, but it was eventually decided that the powers of the Ausschuss were broad enough to enable it to call them. The burden of the general president was reduced by relieving him altogether of calls, transfers, ordinations, installations and visitations of congregations. Not only did two district presidents share these duties, but they in turn were relieved almost entirely of visitations. For the immediate future the effect of this change was, however, considerably diminished through the election of Grossmann to the presidency of the large Western District in addition to his synodical presidency.[35] The new Ausschuss was not a reestablishment of the body which had borne that name during the first decade, which had been the organ of the ministerium and exercised administrative functions. It was conceived apparently as a committee for preliminary consideration of business to come before conventions, but the long intervals between such meetings caused it to become an executive committee which in emergencies might act in place of a convention.[36]

---

[33] District presidents had similar duties in regard to district conventions as the general president to the general convention and were responsible for execution of their resolutions. They were in charge of calls and transfers and could provisionally admit pastors and congregations subject to approval by the district convention. They also acted on complaints, but could expel only after full disciplinary procedure and with consent of the Ausschuss. The secretary was to keep a roster of pastors and congregations and convention minutes. No treasurer was provided.

[34] Even the district presidents were thus relieved of this duty, except that they were to visit the visitors.

---

[35] K. B. XVI, 24, 188. Klindworth became vice-president and List also did double duty as secretary of both synod and Western District. The eastern officers were, Deindoerfer, Kroenke, Fuehr. Grossmann was obliged by illness to resign all offices in 1875 and was retained as synodical but not as district president, Synodalbericht 1875, 30, 31. He had had the assistance of the visitors, however, of whom four had been provided for the Western District, the Eastern District having only one, K. B. XVI, 18, 139, and did not serve a congregation during this period, though he probably did some teaching at the seminary.

[36] The Eastern Conference had suggested such a committee consisting of the synodical officers and one theological professor to bring definite recommendations before the synod on all matters which would require resolutions or decisions. This function was usually performed by floor committees which did not have time to do it properly with the result that lengthy debates ensued. With the growth of synod care must be taken that conventions did not last too long and that business should not crowd out doctrinal discussions. See the letter from the conference cited in footnote 27. The two elected members were S. Fritschel and Schieferdecker. Klindworth also was either elected or served as western vice-president, because Grossmann held two presidencies, Beschluesse 1873 in I. S. D.

The synodical convention itself was not greatly affected by the new constitution. Under the constitution of 1864 each convention fixed the interval until the next session and determined time and place of meeting. A three-year interval elapsed without a convention between 1864 and 1867, otherwise biennial sessions were held and between 1867 and 1869 there was a special convention.[37] The new provision for four-year intervals met a test when a demand for a special session arose in 1874, and in 1875 a special session took place, but it was given a trial between 1875 and 1879.[38] Membership provisions remained unchanged, all pastors were to attend and all separately organized congregations which held membership were to send a delegate. In 1868 regulations had been adopted which required lay delegates to present credentials and both pastors who did not attend and congregations which did not send delegates were required to present excuses.[39] Considerable numbers of pastors were always absent, but at every convention a majority of them was in attendance. The congregations

---

[37] Conventions usually passed a resolution fixing time and place of the next one and thus automatically determined the intervals. The convention of 1867 was held at Toledo, all others in the west, though that of 1873 was originally also scheduled for Toledo. Presumably pastors submitted invitations. These may have been solicited in advance. Letters, Ade - Grossmann, Mendota, February 24, 1873; Vogel - Grossmann, Madison, January 4, 1873, in I. S. D., indicate that Grossmann had inquired in both cases whether the relocated 1873 meeting could be invited and responses were favorable in both cases. The convention met at Davenport, however. Time until 1871 was set for early September. The last of these dates was changed to June as has been noted in chapter XII. Thereafter the conventions met in June, even that of 1879 which celebrated an anniversary that came in August. Time and place can be found in Chronik or Kirchenblatt. A list may be appended: 1867, Toledo; 1868, Madison; 1869, Galena; 1871, Dubuque; 1873, Davenport; 1875, Madison; 1879, Maxfield.

[38] The new constitution said nothing about fixing time and place, but it must have been the intention to continue the old custom, for the convention of 1873 authorized the president exceptionally to fix time and place for the next time and gave the same permission to district presidents for the first district sessions, K. B. XVI, 24, 188. This would indicate that invitations were usually solicited, but had not been in this instance, because of the need to secure a new location in 1873. The special session of 1875 met at Madison and fixed no place for 1879 probably because the session was special and the Davenport resolution was held to apply. A letter, Bredow - --, Maxfield, February 26, 1879, in I. S. D., indicates that Maxfield and

---

Dubuque issued invitations in that year and argued the case of Maxfield, which was selected. The constitution did give district conventions authority to fix time and place of their meetings, subject to the provision that they were to meet twice between general conventions. The Western District resolved in 1876 that invitations from congregations could be considered only if submitted three months in advance, K. B. XII, 14, 108. Both districts held conventions in 1874 and again in 1876 and 1877. The Eastern District held one in 1878, while the Western did not. Eastern District conventions were held: 1874, Toledo; 1876, Defiance; 1877, Toledo; 1878, Riga; and in the west 1874, Mendota; 1876, Maxfield; 1877, Iowa City.

[39] Pastors were to give truthful reasons to the president in writing, oral excuses were not to be accepted, congregations were to send written excuses through their pastors, K. B. XI, 23, 179. In 1869 twenty pastors sent written excuses which were accepted, fifteen were listed as unexcused. The convention reprimanded the congregations because only eleven had sent excuses, XII, 24, 190. This may be compared with 1868 when the regulation was adopted and when congregations were not mentioned. Six pastors were listed who had sent no excuses, but only two eastern pastors were present and the rest had asked them to secure excuses, which were granted. Two written excuses were not accepted, XI, 23, 178-9. In 1871 twenty-two congregations sent excuses, twenty pastors were excused and fourteen sent no excuses, K. B. XIV, 14, 179. In 1873 the corresponding figures were twenty-five, thirty-four, eight, XVI, 17, 130. Both districts adopted similar regulations, for the eastern see K. B. XVI, 12, 96. The Western District provided in 1876 that pastors who were absent

had a much poorer record, the number of excuses usually exceeded the number of delegates present and many congregations sent neither delegates nor excuses.[40] Since no eastern congregation sent a delegate to any convention before 1879, except probably to that held at Toledo in 1867, it is understandable that the Eastern District was anxious to have district conventions, in order to arouse an interest in synodical matters

---

without excuse, should be reprimanded and that two successive such absences should furnish presumption of withdrawal, XIX, 14, 109. This was to be published with convention announcements and was in 1877, XX, 15, 121. Congregations were asked to send delegates with credentials or excuses and the secretary was instructed to call the rule to the attention of pastors absent without excuse and to admonish congregations who were remiss, XX, 23, 179.

[40] Attendance lists were usually given in Chronik or Kirchenblatt. The records run:

	Pastors present	Pastors absent	Lay delegates
1867	34	16	14
1868	33	27	7
1869	37	35	11
1871	47	34	20
1873	58	42	11
1875	71	43	12
1879	102	34	32

There were usually a number of advisory members, teachers or assistant pastors and a number of guests, sometimes pastors from other synods. In 1867 the Pennsylvania Synod sent a delegate to Toledo. In 1867 all eastern pastors were present, but when the conventions were held in the west the east was usually poorly represented. In 1868 there were two, in 1869 three, in 1873 ten, in 1875 six eastern pastors present, for 1879 the writer has seen only the totals, no listing of individuals, but there was probably a larger number. At the only convention held in the east sixteen western pastors were present and sixteen absent. No congregation sent delegates to every convention, although Galena always did until 1875, when it withdrew from the synod. In 1867, however, the congregations sending delegates were not identified, it is likely that few western congregations could send them to Toledo.

in its laity. It may be noted that lay representation at district conventions in the east was better proportionally than in the west, after the districts were formed, but it was not good in either district.[41] Late in the period attempts were made to induce more congregations to send delegates, but this problem was not solved during the period.[42] Heavy travel expenses seem frequently to have been given as excuses for non-attendance by both pastors and congregations. Attempts were made to assist pastors in meeting these costs

---

There is also no identification for 1879. Subject to these qualifications St. Sebald which had a perfect record in the first decade, was unrepresented only in 1871.

[41] The writer has seen no figures for the first Western District convention in 1874. In that year in the east seventeen out of twenty-four parishes sent delegates. The total number of congregations, not all synodical, was forty-two, that of delegates nineteen. This was, however, the high point. In 1876 there were ten lay delegates, in 1877 eleven, in 1878 also eleven, *Chronik* gives all these except 1874, which are in *K. B.* XVII, 14, 185. The number of pastors present usually ran twenty to twenty-five. In the west there were ten lay delegates in 1876, thirteen in 1877, *K. B.* XIX, 21, 160; *Chronik*, 138, but the district was much larger with forty-four and forty-eight pastors present and some thirty absent, against two to five absentees in the east.

[42] *K. B.* XXI, 4, 31-32 carried a statement by eleven of the thirteen lay delegates who had attended the western convention of 1877. They testified that, formerly indifferent, attendance had made them value their right of representation and given them a greater interest in church affairs and better understanding of them. They urged all congregations to send delegates. A part of the difficulty was that a good many congregations did not hold membership, despite earlier endeavors in this respect. The Eastern District continued these endeavors in 1878 by requesting pastors to inquire into reasons for failure to join the synod and noting them in parochial reports, *K. B.* XXI, 16, 126.

at various times, through help from congregations, proposal of a common travel treasury, and equalization of costs at a specific convention, but no permanent system was established.[43]

Convention procedure became established gradually by custom. Over against the first decade, changes gradually took place. Papers and doctrinal discussions, though not eliminated, dropped into secondary position except at times of stress and transaction of business came to predominate. In line with this change the synodical address of the president became a presidential report. Reports were also submitted by other officers, committees and by the educational institutions. Floor committees brought in resolutions on basis of such reports. The establishment of the Ausschuss was in part a response to a felt need for a preliminary committee. Occasionally conferences or congregations presented resolutions or inquiries. Debates were often extensive and on important matters provisional arrangements were repeatedly put into effect and, pending final decisions, studies by conferences were ordered or drafts and projects assigned to individuals or conferences.[44] District conventions modeled their procedure along similar lines. During the period 1875-1879 when no general convention met, there were several instances of the transaction of synodical business through action in concert by the districts.[45]

---

[43] Grossmann published a suggestion in 1867 under which congregations which could not send delegates to Toledo were asked to assist their pastors to go there and the wealthier eastern congregations, which would not have heavy expenses that year were asked to raise offerings toward the travel costs of western pastors. Each pastor was to read this suggestion to his congregation and the Galena Conference was to apportion funds raised by the offerings, K. B. X, 5, 33-34. Since no detailed report was published, results cannot be stated, but the good attendance of western pastors makes it likely that something was done. The Eastern Conference resolution submitted to the convention of 1873 unsuccessfully proposed establishment of a Synodalreisekasse with a treasurer in each district, to which every pastor would pay $4 annually. If conventions were spaced four years apart this should defray all travel costs and leave a surplus for special conventions. See letter from the conference cited in footnote 27. The Western District resolved in 1877 that travel costs for the jubilee convention in 1879 should be born in common, to make it possible for all pastors to attend. Each pastor was to report his expenses to a designated treasurer, who would calculate the median cost and then collect or repay accordingly, K. B. XX, 22, 170. The Eastern District accepted this plan in 1878, XXI, 16, 125.

---

[44] Individual documentation of the various points would seem unnecessary since instances of all of them have occurred in previous presentations. The reports on the conventions in Chronik and Kirchenblatt may be consulted.

[45] The earliest instance of this kind occurred in 1874 in regard to the Pfarrwitwenkasse. It will be remembered that the districts did not in this case take identical action, but that the more moderate proposals of the Western District were put into effect and provisionally ratified by the general convention of 1875. In 1875 the Western District alone also adopted provisional seminary regulations and endorsed a special convention of the synod for the next year. The Eastern District had already met. The basis for such district actions was clearly the power of the Ausschuss to secure district opinions, which was done in 1874 in regard to the latter points, apparently after the eastern meeting. For the later period several instances have been noted, such as the travel cost arrangement for 1879, tentative approval of the teachers' seminary project, perhaps the Reiseprediger arrangements of 1877 should also be mentioned, though that was a project of one district approved by the other. In 1876 both districts set 1879 as the date for the next general convention, K. B. XIX, 14, 108; XX, 2, 9,

The constitution of 1873 underwent considerable modification before it was definitively adopted. It cannot be stated whether the conferences gave it closer study as they had been directed to do in 1873. The two districts were rather slow about complying with this directive, but in 1877 the Eastern District began a discussion of the constitution paragraph by paragraph, which was continued in the west later in the same year and completed in the east in 1878.[46] Rather extensive changes over against 1873 were made when the convention of 1879 definitively adopted the revised version.[47]

---

and also adopted concurrent resolutions of tribute to the theological professors occasioned by the Klindworth pamphlet aspersions. The Western District also adopted a modification of the rule in regard to dismissals for congregations, which the eastern accepted in the next year, XIX, 14, 108; XX, 14, 131, which in modified form went into the constitution later. The special offering for 1879 with detailed regulations also was ordered in this way, XX, 22, 170; XXI, 15, 125. The Western District where most synodical officials resided usually took the lead. The Eastern District in 1877 resolved that its president should attend the western conventions and report to the eastern conferences, XX, 16, 122-3, 125-6. Grossmann probably made similar reports to the western convention.

[46] Because conference minutes are not extant, the writer cannot determine whether or to what extent the conferences concerned themselves with constitutional revision. Perhaps the delay in district action until 1877 indicates that conferences were giving preliminary attention to the subject. The Eastern District in 1877 heard papers on the subject and revised, paragraphs 1-12. The west carried on the discussion to paragraph 27 and in the next year the east completed it. K. B. XX, 15, 115-7; 17, 129-31; 22, 169-70; XXI, 16, 126.

[47] Chronik, 150-153, reports the adoption and brings the changes. The constitution was ordered printed. Some changes were made in the version submitted by the districts.

While the confessional position was not altered, pastors on admission were now required to concur with the definition of the position on controversial issues which had been adopted in 1875. The four-year interval between conventions was dropped and both district and synodical conventions were authorized to determine, how often, when and where they would meet.[48] Procedures already in practice were incorporated and more flexible provisions introduced.[49] There were changes in the duties of officers and organs and their number was increased somewhat.[50] The most important of these additions was provision for district treasurers who were to receive all offerings raised in the district and forward them to the appropriate treasuries. All synodical treasuries had their own treasurers, who were to administer them according to synodical directions and make annual reports to an auditing committee. In addition there was a general treasurer, who was to receive semi-annual reports on all treasuries and make detailed annual reports to the president.[51] A section on conferences was added, they were to serve educational and fraternal purposes and for discussion of ecclesiastic affairs, all pastors were obligated to attend regularly and punctually to perform assigned duties.[52] Again there was no amending clause.

---

[48] The Ausschuss was also definitely authorized to call special conventions of the synod.

[49] Many of the changes in the first six sections were minor. The following may be noted. Honorable dismissals to pastors and congregation were denied, if they refused to submit to investigation of complaints pending at the time of withdrawal. This wasa greatly modified version of a paragraph requested, as noted earlier, by both districts, declaring it to be the duty of congregations to hear the defense of synod, if they withdrew because of accusations against it by their pastors. See K. B. XIX, 14, 108. Congregations could be expelled if they persisted in anti-scriptural and anti-confessional practices. The synod might divide itself into as many districts as were deemed necessary. Subsequent action on this point will be noted. The Ausschuss was definitely authorized to bring important matters of a general nature before district conventions and concurrent district resolutions in such cases were to be considered as synodical resolutions.

[50] Admissions of pastors and congregations was again provisionally assigned to the general president subject to ratification by the next convention. The president was authorized to name committees and to represent the synod over against other bodies. District presidents were specifically authorized to suspend pastors and congregations. District secretaries were to keep rosters of pastors and congregations, receive parochial reports and make compilations for the district presidents. These were to submit them to

---

the general secretary, who was to compile general statistics from them. Secretaries were also to prepare reports on conventions. Membership of the Ausschuss was left at five, but the synod might increase this number. The detailed instructions for examination committees were omitted, but provision was made for an instruction to guide them and their membership was left to discretion of the synod. Provisions previously applying to the Kirchenblatt were applied to all editors. An instruction was authorized for synodical trustees, who were to administer synodical property according to its terms and make reports. Regulations for visitors were revised and they were to conduct investigations only when specifically authorized or when visitations unintentionally turned into them.

[51] District treasurers were to transmit funds monthly and to make annual reports to district auditing committees. These as well as the synodical auditing committee were to be provided for by the respective conventions. Synodical treasuries were listed as institutional and synodical treasuries, Pfarrwitwenkasse, Reisepredigerkasse, etc., (sic). There was still a mission treasury, which was not named. The books of the general treasurer were to give exact information on the condition of synodical finances as a whole and the reasons for eventual debt increases.

[52] Neither number of conferences nor mode of creating them was regulated. They were, however, placed under the

For a second time, thus constitutional developments which had been in the making for some time, resulted in the adoption of a constitution in an anniversary year and at the end of the period, leaving the testing of the system established to the future. In this instance, however, the salient features of the change had been in effect long enough to prove their utility. Neither the transfer of all affairs regarding calls and vacancies to the districts, nor the district system itself was materially affected by revisions made in 1879. On the contrary the latter was confirmed and strengthened by a resolution which permitted the unwieldly Western District to subdivide itself.[53] The thoroughgoing revision of the financial system of the synod in 1879, however, remained to be tested. Since financial administration had often been a cause of complaint, the new system was a change of great moment and some attention should be given to its antecedents.

So far as district treasuries are concerned, the Eastern District began to feel a need for its own at once. It asked the Ausschuss for permission to create a district treasury in 1874 for such purposes as providing funds for

---

jurisdiction of the districts, and were to report their resolutions to the district presidents, though they were not to exercise functions of church government. They too determined frequency, time and place of sessions themselves.

[53] Chronik, 155. Division was carried out in the next period. The trustees were also instructed to incorporate the synod. This would indicate that the procedures described in chapter X had not been consummated.

assistance to the district president. No regular treasury appears to have been created at that time, but some provision of funds from the Synodalkasse was arranged.[54] References have already been made to difficulties which the major synodical treasuries, particularly that for educational institutions met during the period. In large part these were due to inadequate income. But low income was in part due to failure to raise the required offerings in many congregations. The system of offerings and their distribution through the church year has been discussed, as have measures designed to bring about regular collection.[55] The synod also made attempts from time to time to bring about improved bookkeeping and accounting.[56] In 1868 resolutions were passed requiring all treasurers to bring their books, closed and in good order, to conventions and to add a perspective or summary which was to be published in the Kirchenblatt and preserved in a special book in the archives.[57] In 1869 provision was made for a standing auditing committee which was to revise all books carefully from time to time and a number of resolutions were adopted on the perennial subject of offerings not lifted.[58]

---

[54] The request is reported in K. B. XVII, 14, 107. In later years the district named a committee to raise funds and provided an assistant for Deindoerfer, XX, 14, 106, and asked its members for voluntary contributions to enable him to visit Western District conventions, XX, 16, 123. A sheet containing an accounting for official expenses by Deindoerfer is in Iowa Synod Financial Records. It appears that he was permitted to retain his own contribution to the Synodalkasse and such others as were paid to him and also some of the offerings raised for that treasury and that special offerings were raised at such occasions as visitations and installations. For the period November 1877 to March 1879 he reported receipts of $136.12 and expenses of $132.68 including some payments to an assistant.

[55] See chapter XIV. It may be added that the contributions which pastors were to make to the Synodalkasse was raised to $1 in 1867, Zusammenstellung 1867 and to $2 in 1868, Zusammenstellung 1868 in I. S. D. This treasury was in chronic difficulties and also in 1868 the synod assigned it ten per cent of the funds raised through the annual special appeal, then first authorized, the rest to go to the institutions, Ibid. The president's report had recommended the appeal, K. B. XI, 20, 160.

---

[56] These measures indicate that there was a weakness at this point. Klindworth stressed disorderly and defective bookkeeping strongly in his subsequent indictment, e. g., Traurige Zustaende, 64-65. See also the reply, Bericht... Untersuchung, 54-8. While Klindworth distorted matters to suit his purposes, it seems clear that bookkeeping was deficient, though not dishonest. Neuendettelsau was also critical on this point, see letters, Deinzer - --, Neuendettelsau, June 22, 1876; Wucherer - --, June 2, 1876, in I. S. D. It was, of course, true that bookkeeping was often necessarily in the hands of very busy men untrained in this respect.

[57] K. B. XI, 23, 179. This convention also provided for a standing committee on accounts to check all the books, K. B. XI, 23, 179-80, Zusammenstellung 1868 in I. S. D. These resolutions were carried out so far as submitting books was concerned and some tabulations appeared, but unfortunately the special book is not in the archives.

[58] The treasurers were instructed to close their books each quarter and to send quarterly statements to the chairman of the auditing committee. This provision was recommended by the auditing committee of the convention, which found it difficult to do its work during the session. Indications are that this resolution was not carried out with regularity, few traces of the work of the auditing committee have been found and see the statement by Klindworth, cited in footnote 56. On the other hand there were later audits at conventions. On delinquencies in offerings it was provided that the secretary publish the list of prescribed offerings; that three months after the respective dates, the treasurers inform the secretary

In 1873 it was ordered that new books should be established for the seminary and for the seminary fund and that strong measures be taken against delinquents to the printing treasury.[59] The new system established in 1879 was therefore the culmination of series of endeavors to provide an efficient financial administration.

The Iowa Synod had been experimenting in constitutional respects through the first quarter century of its existence and it arrived at a definitive system only at the end of that period. It will be remembered that the founders had undertaken the organization of a synod under pressure and against their own judgment in 1854. Between them these men possessed

---

of delinquencies, who was to send reminders; that the secretary annually prepare a tabulation of offerings on basis of parochial reports and present it to the synod; that delinquent pastors be called to account before the synod by name, K. B. XII, 24, 189-90. For 1871 such a tabulation, based on parochial reports, appeared in K. B. XV, 11, supplement. They may regularly have been given to conventions, but if the delinquents were not present, not much would happen.

[59] Beschluesse 1873 in I. S. D. and K. B. XVI, 24, 188. It was also provided that gifts without designation be administered by the synodical treasurer until a convention could make dispositions. The committee report on which the recommendations were based is in Iowa Synod Financial Records. It presents summaries and comments for six treasuries. The complaint against the seminary books was that they were kept in an unbusinesslike manner and hard to find through. The committee moved that they be checked with care. See the investigation report cited in footnote 56. It may be added that the convention of 1875 ordered the financial reports submitted to it published in the Kirchenblatt, Synodalbericht 1875, 31.

rare talents as pastors, teachers, theologians, but they were all young and had no great administrative experience. Maintenance of a synod also required institutions and undertakings which for long exceeded the means of the small synod. Much reliance had to be placed upon foreign aid, which was generously forthcoming, but its acceptance had a tendency to weaken the sense of responsibility of pastors and to inhibit its development among the laity. Maintenance of a pastoral hierarchy during most of the first decade did nothing toward securing fuller lay cooperation and fostered a spirit of independence in the clergy. The substitution of a strong centralized executive in 1864 did not work well, because it made excessive demands on one man, and was maintained too long. Synodical consciousness tended to remain slack under these circumstances. Though the synod grew, it remained difficult to support it or to develop an efficient financial administration. The constitution of 1873 with its later revision at last represented an organization based on sound and workable principles. Sound financial administration too was provided. A stronger organization was a necessary condition for meeting problems, but did not in itself overcome established attitudes. The synod still faced the problem of creating an enthusiastic synodical consciousness in its laymen and of overcoming a self-centered and sometimes irresponsible sense of independence in many of its clergymen.

CHAPTER XVII

CONTROVERSY: DOCTRINAL DISSENSION 1854-1875

In the opening chapters notice has been taken of the development of controversy between Loehe and the Missouri Synod on the doctrines of church and ministry. Missouri held the church to be exclusively the invisible communion of true believers, while Loehe held that it had also an external and visible aspect consisting of the communion of those who shared Word and sacraments. Missouri contended that the ministry was divinely ordained through the universal priesthood of believers and that the ministerial office was established through transference of functions from congregations to pastors. Loehe maintained that the divine injunction to establish the ministry had been given to the church as such and denied the transference theory. Notice has also been taken of the diverging point of view on the significance of these controversies. Loehe held that the doctrines involved had not been fixed definitively and that differing opinions in regard to them need not be church-separating. Missouri, however, had been willing to tolerate the differences only temporarily and had broken with Loehe when he showed no signs of yielding.

Grossmann and Deindoerfer had both defended Loehe's views tenaciously. S. Fritschel and Schueller, who arrived in time to participate in the organization of the Iowa Synod also shared them, and thus the original membership of the synod was committed to Loehe's views. While the Richtungsparagraph adopted in 1854 did not specifically mention the controverted doctrines, it expressed the broader viewpoint which included them.[1] Since that paragraph expressed allegiance to the symbols in a defined sense and since it asserted limited possibilities of doctrinal progress, it clearly took up a controversial position at least over against Missouri. The original members were in complete harmony with the specific position taken by the Neuendettelsau school and for the time being took it for granted that their organization would consist of members who like themselves would accept its broad position in regard to symbols and controversial questions and also its theological peculiarities. Several years were to pass, before the synod

---

[1] The controversial points are briefly restated here for the sake of completeness. Development of the controversy and documentation can be found in chapters I-III. The Richtungsparagraph was given in translation, chapter III, and in the original in footnote 45. Missouri was later to assert that the synod adopted the paragraph and its position as a binding obligation in return for German support. The writer has found no evidence to indicate that a binding or contractual relationship was established. It is true that the founders individually at various times had assumed binding obligations. Deindoerfer had agreed not to leave the colony at Frankenhilf without German consent, letters. Loehe - Deindoerfer, August 8; Deindoerfer - Loehe, December 6, 1852, type copies in I. S. D. This agreement involved no doctrinal obligations and was terminated when Deindoerfer obtained German consent for removal to Iowa. It is quite possible that Deindoerfer contemplated a similar arrangement in Iowa, since colonization there too was part of the original plan. Colonization, however, did not prove feasible and there is no trace of such an agreement, in fact Deindoerfer did not remain long at St. Sebald and his removal to Madison seems to have been arranged within synodical circles. Grossmann was bound by an elaborate contract defining his duties and privileges at Saginaw, which also contained a clause requiring German consent for resignation, but no doctrinal obligations, Vereinbarung 1852 in I. S. D. The removal of the seminary did not affect this contract and it was still in force in 1854, but it had no bearing on the position taken then. S. Fritschel in 1854 signed an agreement with the Gesellschaft according to which he was to adhere to the Neuendettelsau Richtung. The wording corresponds exactly to that of the synodical Richtungsparagraph. Indeed it seems likely that this paragraph may have been taken verbatim from the agreement. However, the latter bound S. Fritschel personally. It provided that if he should change his mind, he was to resign his position, leave its locality if that were asked, and repay expenses of his education and passage, of which an accounting was appended. It did not therefore bind a synod, not yet in existence. The agreement contained a paragraph in which the Gesellschaft formally reserved property rights and rights of supervision over any foundations (Stiftungen) it had made or might make for the new Iowa Synod, but it disclaimed any intention of rights of government over the synod and made no

---

doctrinal stipulations in this connection, Vereinbarung zwischen Konrad Sigmund Fritschel und der ersten Abtheilung der Gesellschaft fuer innere Mission im Sinne der lutherischen Kirche, S. Fritschel Papers. Schueller was bound by a similar agreement, K. M. 1854, 6, 48. This source indicates, however, that this was a new arrangement and therefore it did not extend to Deindoerfer and Grossmann, although there are indications that later candidates signed similar documents. Neuendettelsau did therefore pledge individuals to its Richtung, but not the synod, though it undoubtedly hoped indirectly to hold the synod in line through its pledged members. A considerable number of men later foresook Richtung and synod, the author has found nothing to indicate whether repayments were made. Grossmann and at least in part S. Fritschel were relieved of their obligation in 1855, when the Gesellschaft found itself unable to support the seminary, see the Protokoll cited, footnote 18, chapter IV, and the seminary became synodical property, subject solely to synodical control. It is probable that the property stipulation of 1854 was due to the protestations of the Iowa pastors that they could not support the seminary and did not wish to take it over, rather than to any desire to control the theological fountainhead of the new synod. There is thus no evidence that the synod as such was bound by any formal agreement to adhere to the Neuendettelsau Richtung. All its founders accepted it, two having formal agreements to adhere to it, two none. All knew that support would be dependent upon adherence. All were personally in complete harmony with the Richtung and the three who were to spend their lives in the service of the synod, remained faithful to it. So far as the record shows that is also true of the fourth whose departure was not based on doctrinal dissension.

had to face the question whether its acceptance of the broad position would necessitate toleration of divergent opinions on specific issues in its own midst.

Neuendettelsau gave its approval to the position adopted as a matter of course and manifested it through its continued support with men and money. It also did not foresee later divergences in detail, but shared the assumption of complete harmony held by the founders. Missouri on its part publicly broke with Loehe and held the Iowa Synod to represent his Richtung in America.[2] The synod soon indicated disapproval of the Iowa Richtung and refusal to grant it church fellowship.[3]

---

[2] Pastor Roebbelen in 1854 published a pamphlet, Wie steht Herr Pastor Loehe zur lutherischen Kirche, which the writer has not seen. A pastoral conference late in 1854 viewed it as an attack on Loehe and felt that the position had been misrepresented, but decided not to reply, Protokollbuch, Minutes Min. Conf., Dubuque, December 7, 8, 1854; Chronik, 8. An early reference to the synod as a "Loeheischen Separat-Verband in Iowa," Lutheraner, XII, 24, 191, may serve as an example of Missouri's opinion.

[3] Pastor Roebbelen published a sermon in Lutheraner, XI, 1, in which he listed the seminary in Iowa among other causes worthy of benevolence. In two later issues he referred to protests against its inclusion, but stood his ground, regarding the Iowans as afflicted with an erring conscience on a point which to them seemed subordinate, XI, 5, 37; 8, 62. A little later Walther commented upon Loehe statements on the synod in K. M. expressing the opinion that the Richtungsparagraph veiled refusal to accept the symbolical doctrines on church and ministry, XI, 20, 156. Next appeared an article by Pastor Fick which gave a negative reply to the question, whether Missouri members could be advised to join Iowa congregations, on the ground that Iowa's statement showed that it refused to take the quia position on the symbols. The article also held that the doctrines of church and ministry were definitely settled in the symbols and that Loehe was trying to break down their authority to make room for his theories, XI, 26, 203-4; XII, 1, 5-6. Walther himself strongly endorsed Fick's position and warned against breaking down symbolical authority and thus opening doors to unionism, XI, 26, 203. This would seem to indicate denial of church

The synod itself meanwhile made studies of confessional articles and discussed its position toward the symbols at conferences.[4] Its approach to Buffalo made it desirable to state its position more explicitly. At its third convention in 1856 it was ready to set forth its views on church and ministry in some detail and also to define its attitude toward the symbols. Discussion of the latter point may be deferred for the moment. In regard to the church a statement consisting of eight theses was discussed and adopted. It held that while the symbols did not distinguish between a church visible and invisible, they did on basis of Scriptures define it so that both sides were recognized. In its essence the church was the invisible communion of true believers, but there was also a visible and imperfect church gathered around the administration of Word and sacraments. The statement on the ministry consisted of thirteen theses. It rejected the transference theory and held that the ministry was a divine institution, deriving purely spiritual powers to preach and administer sacraments from Christ's commission. Within its sphere congregations owed it obedience, but it had no power of domination over them.[5]

---

fellowship. Iowa itself does not seem to have been certain about this for a conference in 1856 considered putting the question to Missouri directly, but decided against it, because previous inquiries had gone unanswered, Protokollbuch, Minutes Min. Conf., Dubuque, September 4-5, 1856. Chronik, 16, however, has it that the inquiry was resolved.

[4] E. g., at the conference in Dubuque in December, 1854, Chronik, 8.

[5] The statements are in Chronik, 14-15. They represent the synodical view of the doctrines contained in the symbols

Buffalo representatives were in attendance at the convention which adopted these statements. Establishment of church fellowship with that synod resulted from the full concurrence of these delegates and the short period of cordial cooperation between the two church bodies of which notice has been taken in an earlier chapter followed.[6] The subsequent breaking of that relationship did not, however, affect the position taken on church and ministry. The synod had expressed views on these doctrines on which its membership agreed generally. Though not rigidly applied in the sense that in later days absolute conformity was required from all members, the statements expressed the prevailing viewpoint. The position taken opposed that which was so strongly held by Missouri. In regard to the ministry at least, a sharply defined difference was thus continued, which could not be adjusted as long as Missouri insisted upon its position that the transference theory was the definitive symbolical doctrine. This conflict was to continue to divide the two church bodies, but in the immediate future it was to sink into the background and to be overshadowed by sharp dissensions on other points.

---

on these points and assert that they are in harmony with the Scriptures. The statement on the ministry goes into detail on requirements for the office and its duties, asserts that the ius vocationis belongs to the church and that the relative roles of ministerium and congregations should follow the usages of the ancient church. Gradations in the ministry are said to be human, not divine ordinances.

[6] See chapter VI. Chronik, 16, asserts the full agreement of the Buffalo delegates.

Of fundamental importance was the position which the synod had taken toward the symbols in 1856 and which was reasserted and elaborated at the convention of 1858.[7] While the entire Book of Concord was accepted as symbolical and both pastors and congregations were pledged to unconditional acceptance, the synod drew a distinction between confessional and non-confessional content. It differentiated between a dogmatic and a historical method of interpretation. The former took the symbols to be an arbitrary system of doctrines and gave symbolical meaning to every statement they contained. From this position it was apt to use the symbols for the purpose of proving preconceived opinions from them. This method must be rejected, because it ignored the historical character of the symbols and transformed them into rigid canons which they themselves did not pretend to be. The historical method on the other hand proceeded from the point of view that the symbols were and took themselves to be definitive declarations on points of doctrine disputed in controversies which had occurred before or during the Reformation period. An accurate understanding of confessional statements could, therefore, be gained only through reference to the controversies which had occasioned them. Binding confessional declarations were to be found within the symbols only in the thetical and antithetical statements which in each article defined truth over against error. The confessions contained in addition a great deal of explanatory, demonstrative and expository material. Not every doctrine incidentally occurring in such contexts could be considered as having binding symbolical character. This historical method was to be regarded as the correct and proper interpretation of the symbols.

---

[7] Originally recorded in Chronik, 15-16, the theses of 1856 were published K. B. I, 1, and later reprinted in Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 68-9. They are also given with comments in Grossmann's presidential address, Synodalbericht 1858, 5-7. The latter also contains a paper on Iowa and the symbols, which elaborates the position, pp. 8-18, which is summarized Chronik, 23-24. A report on the convention, K. B. I, 10 and 11, adds little on this point, but gives a colorful account of the convention.

The unconditional acceptance of the confessions was thus qualified by reservations resulting from the method of interpretation. The theses of 1856 added a statement asserting that doctrinal development had not reached its final conclusion during the Reformation and that new controversies might be expected to arise. This was the basis of the reference to a striving for greater perfection expressed in the paragraph stating synod's Richtung. In regard to church and ministry, definitive symbolical doctrine, as stated in opposition to Roman error, was recognized as scriptural and binding. In 1858 the transference theory, the question of visibility or invisibility of the church and also certain chiliast opinions were held not to be definitively settled in the symbols and they were therefore declared to be open questions, on which differences of opinion need not be church-separating.[8]

---

[8] The reference to open questions followed a statement that differences on non-essential details had been tolerated in the Lutheran Church since the days of Luther and Melanchthon, Synodalbericht 1858, 13, 14.

In its official adoption of a definite theory of symbolical interpretation and its recognition of the existence of open questions the synod ventured upon theological ground beset with pitfalls. Its statements proved to be susceptible of interpretations which persisted despite repudiation and the synodical report of 1858 was for long to occasion controversy and to furnish ammunition for attacks on the synod's position. Immediately, the elaboration and publication of Iowa's position toward the symbols had some effect on the breach with the Buffalo Synod, although the chiliast declarations of 1858 yet to be noted, were the major point to which Buffalo objected.[9] Missouri immediately identified Iowa's position with that of Loehe and declared it to be contradictory.[10] A little later it rejected the admissibility of Iowa's views on open questions.[11]

---

[9] Disagreement with Buffalo is discussed at length in chapter VI. Grabau had not been present at Dubuque in 1856 when the statement on the symbols was adopted. He must have had a report from two Buffalo delegates who were there and it would seem likely that they were furnished with a copy. If they were not, Grabau may not have seen it until it was published in the Kirchenblatt in 1858. His reaction, colored perhaps by the intervening breach, was given as one of alarm, Sechster Synodalbrief, 6. Subsequent negotiations, described in chapter VI resulted in an understanding, though hardly in agreement on this point. The friendship might have cooled, but it hardly seems likely that the two synods would have broken it off completely over this point alone.

[10] Lehre und Wehre, IV, 2, 61-3, brought the theses of 1856 as published in 1858. It deplored that Iowa lacked Loehe's candor and honesty, holding that the unconditional pledge on the one hand and the differentiation in content under the theory of historical interpretation on the other were contradictory. V, 9, 28--5, brought a reprint of a critique by Muenkel in his Neues Zeitblatt published in Germany. Muenkel's discussion of the position of the synod on basis of the synodical report of 1858 was moderate in tone, but pointed to pitfalls and dangers in the declarations.

The paper on the symbols, submitted in 1858, discussion and adoption of which fixed the position of the synod in this respect, also contained a reference to eschatalogical questions. It asserted that Article 17 of the Augsburg Confession, in dealing with the last things, concerned itself solely with Anabaptist teachings. Their heresies were rejected, but beyond that the symbols contained nothing binding on eschatalogy and they did not touch in any way on several controversial points in this area. Loehe himself had adopted certain chiliast views and the Neuendettelsau school appears to have emphasized them. The members of the synod apparently had been indoctrinated with them and shared them with a rather joyous exuberance. Their interest in these questions had been revealed to Buffalo, which had never shared them, but since they had not received stress at the time, no immediate controversy had arisen. Attention had, however, been attracted to eschatalogy when a year earlier the Missouri Synod had condemned chiliast opinions of Pastor G. A. Schieferdecker, one of its prominent members, and had expelled him after protracted negotiations. The young leaders of the Iowa Synod felt bound, now that chiliast doctrines had been attacked, to rally to their defense. They did not content themselves with claiming a right to treat them as open questions in the paper on the symbols as just noted, but in a second paper submitted to the convention of 1858, adopted by it as a correct presentation of its views and printed in the synodical report, they set forth their eschatalogical views in some detail and with a good deal of enthusiasm.[12]

---

[11] *Ibid.*, VI, 9, 257-62.

The paper asserted that the eschatalogical questions of the day were not in conflict with symbolical doctrine, they belonged to theological development and reached out beyond the symbols into areas not covered by them. They involved interpretation of obscure scriptural passages and points which were as yet uncertain as well as others which were asserted to be established beyond all doubt. Among the latter several were specified. A personal anti-Christ, not an institution like the papacy, was to appear who would assert supreme spiritual and temporal power, have himself worshipped in place of God and persecute the church. A conversion of the Jews to Christianity would take place. A temporary visible appearance of Christ would occur to destroy the anti-Christ and establish the millennium. A resurrection of martyrs would accompany the millennium. While Satan would be chained during the millennium, it would be free neither of sin, nor of suffering, nor would it be a temporal kingdom of the saints with the destruction of all the godless. It would be a period of quiet following upon days of turbulence in which good would be ascendant over evil. After its close, Satan, released once more, would bring about apostasy and the general resurrection of the dead and judgment day would follow. It should be observed that despite the assertion of certainty, the chiliast doctrines were all regarded as open questions. It was the duty of those who held them to defend them, but church fellowship should not depend upon their acceptance. They were not to receive especial stress in preaching, but neither were they to be suppressed and ignored.

---

[12] Synodalbericht 1858, 19-31. Chronik, 24-5, gives the essence of the paper and, p. 23, brings a statement from the presidential address, which notes that synod had been attacked in regard to its position toward the symbols and toward eschatological questions and that it would therefore be its duty to clarify its position unmistakably in both respects. It is also stated there that both papers by the two theological professors were thoroughly discussed and accepted by the convention as expressing its views. G. Fritschel wrote the paper on chiliasm. Attention may also be called to a set of nine theses on chiliasm which had been submitted to a conference attended by Buffalo delegates in the spring at Madison on pp. 20-21 and a shorter set of five theses discussed with Grabau at Wartburg shortly before the convention on p. 22.

It was this assertion of strongly held chiliast views which produced the violent reaction in Buffalo. The friendly relationship was broken off, church fellowship was cancelled and Buffalo's organ indulged in denunciations of its former friend.[13] It was to be expected that Missouri would also react unfavorably, particularly when the synod in the next year admitted Pastor Schieferdecker and that part of his congregation at Altenburg, Missouri, which adhered to him.[14] It was not long before Missouri's publications took direct issue with Iowa on its chiliast stand, attacking the doctrines, asserting that they constituted a departure from Lutheranism and maintaining that they revealed a trend toward Romanism.[15]

---

[13] The denunciations are mentioned repeatedly in contemporary records. An instance of Buffalo's hostility was given in chapter XI, footnote 52. The author is unable to give documentation for Buffalo's Kirchliches Informatorium, because he did not have access to its files and saw only a few numbers from an earlier period.

[14] Missouri publications over a period of years were frequently to refer to Schieferdecker's admission in terms

It is evident from the various doctrinal declarations between 1854 and 1858 that the synod during these years adhered to the Neuendettelsau Richtung faithfully and in detail. Its Richtungsparagraph, adopted in 1854 and incorporated meanwhile in its constitution for congregations, indicated its attitude in general terms. The position toward the symbols as defined in 1858 elaborated a theory under which unconditional acceptance of confessional substance left room for dissent in incidental doctrinal assertions which were held not to be intended to have binding confessional character. On this basis the controverted questions in regard to church and ministry had been declared to be open questions, in which varying opinions

---

that indicated resentment. In 1859 the synod did not issue a direct statement on this point. Lehre und Wehre, V, 2, 63, reported a refusal of the Tennessee Synod to entertain an application from Schieferdecker and, 9, 288, commenting on a report in K. M. that he would join Iowa, expressed the opinion that his congregation would oppose this.

[15] The source last cited commented adversely upon a number of related points, particularly the Toledo quarrel and a statement that everything was in motion and ferment. It reprimanded a reckless desire to throw the church into confusion. The Toledo quarrel was reported in Lutheraner XV, 21, 165-6 on basis of an account in the Kirchenblatt and in Lehre und Wehre, V, 5, 146-50, from Kirchliches Informatorium, in both cases with critical comments. In Lutheraner, XV, 6, 45-6, comments on the convention of 1858 struck a moderate, sorrowful tone. Young men, loyal to their teachers, had fallen into unlutheran error, the consequences of which they could not measure, but their ideas had both rationalist and romanizing implications.

were not church-separating. The synod had issued a declaration clarifying the stand of its members on these points which was in complete harmony with that of Neuendettelsau and was also asserted to be in full agreement with the symbols. In the area of eschatology the synod had declared that the symbols condemned and rejected only the crass chiliasm of the Anabaptists, leaving a number of controverted points as open questions. It had revealed the position taken by its members on these points, a position which again was in full harmony with that of Neuendettelsau and which was asserted to lie beyond the symbols and therefore not to conflict with them. The implication was that the progress to which the Richtungsparagraph referred was to be attained through serious and dignified theological controversy over the open questions, in the hope of eventually reaching agreements in which all Lutherans could concur.

Until 1858 the synod had been able to agree on its doctrinal declarations unanimously and thus to adhere in its entirety to the Neuendettelsau Richtung and to form a body faithfully representing it in the Lutheran Church in America. This had been possible without difficulty because the membership was small and because all the pastors had directly or indirectly come under the influence of the Neuendettelsau school and had accepted its position. In and after 1858 situations arose

---

Pastor Beyer challenged Iowa's Lutheranism in Lehre und Wehre, V, 10, 310-18, and questioned its interpretations in derisive and offensive language.

in which applicants for membership dissented in some respects from the doctrinal declarations of the first four years or in which pastors who held membership changed their positions. The synod thus had to face the question whether it must insist upon rigid conformity in all respects as a condition of membership. A decision involved considerations of far-reaching significance. On the one hand it posed the question whether the Richtung of the synod should continue to be identical with that of Neuendettelsau. On the other hand it involved problems of consistency and synodical discipline.

The synod does not appear ever to have considered a policy of requiring rigid conformity. From a practical point of view such a policy would have had the advantage of maintaining unity and of eliminating internal doctrinal dissension, although it would also have been likely to lead to numerous withdrawals in the course of time and to inhibit growth. Whatever weight such considerations may have had, they seem to have been overshadowed by more fundamental issues. The positions taken by 1858 included on the one hand the basic question of the attitude toward the symbols and on the other the resultant stand on various open questions. The synod could not make concessions on the former without abandoning its Richtung entirely. But if the latter was to be maintained was it consistent to require internal agreement on the open questions? The fundamental principle was that differences in these matters were not church-separating. This principle would have suffered violence had the members of synod whose opinions differed on open questions been expelled, or had applicants been denied admission on such grounds. The synod would have had to resort to the same inflexible rigidity which originally had driven its founders out of the Missouri Synod.

The question under discussion arose during the convention of 1858 which adopted the declarations on the position toward the symbols and chiliasm. Five candidates were ready for ordination at that time and several did not share the chiliast views. Although no resolution on the subject was placed on record all were ordained and received. The synod thus indicated that adoption of the chiliast paper meant approval of its contents by the voting members, but not definition of a synodical doctrine binding upon every member.[16] Although this seems to have been understood within the synod, including the dissenters who joined without protest, it was unfortunate that so important a decision was not clearly expressed and published. After the breach with Buffalo had occurred a ministerial conference in 1859 emphatically pointed out that chiliast points were considered open questions, not church-separating in character, implying as the synod later maintained, that statements in regard to them could not be considered binding either on members or on non-members, who did not share the opinions expressed.[17] The point implied here was openly stated at the next convention in 1860. Criticisms of the synodical report of 1858 had by that time led to the realization that it had given the impression that the chiliast statement was synodical doctrine and that its exuberant tone had led to the conclusion that propagation of this doctrine was synod's _raison d' etre_. A statement was issued which declared that the peculiarity of the synod was not that a _majority of its pastors_[18] held chiliast views, but rather that it emphasized their non-church-separating character.

---

[16] There is no contemporary evidence to substantiate this point. When the charge was raised in the ensuing years that chiliasm had been made an official Iowa doctrine in 1858, the synodical leaders admitted that the synodical report of 1858 gave that impression, but denied that it had been the intention of the convention to do so. For evidence this matter of admissions was adduced. Among various statements to that effect, K. Z., I, 1, 19-20, may be cited. The candidates ordained in that year were Brand, Kluge, Klindworth, Brueckner and Rohrlack. Of these Brand and Rohrlack at a later time definitely objected to chiliasm and Brueckner seems also to have done so. Rohrlack maintained at the time of his withdrawal (1865) that Deindoerfer had told him he could not be ordained, unless he accepted the chiliast declaration. Agreement was necessary for the sake of synodical unity. On this ground he held that chiliasm had been made a synodical doctrine and gave that as part of the reason for his withdrawal in a letter, Rohrlack - Grossmann, Logansville, March 13, 1865, in I. S. D. Rohrlack admitted, however, that Deindoerfer had said anti-chiliasts would not be expelled. He also did not indicate what his own reaction had been, or whether

---

other synodical officers had been consulted. Rohrlack's letter was published in the _Lutheraner_, but Missouri did not use it to disprove the Iowa contention. The probability is that Deindoerfer had acted on his own initiative and since Rohrlack was ordained, he must either have yielded momentarily or Deindoerfer must have withdrawn his demand.

[17] _Protokollbuch_, Minutes Min. Conf., Wartburg, March 24-28, 1859, notes the discussion and adoption of the statement which appeared _K. B._ II, 4, 25-27.

[18] Italics author's. The phrase clearly implies that the synod had pastors who did not share these views.

Chiliasm was not a major concern of the synod, particularly not in its preaching, but a subordinate point. If it received stress in controversy that was because members who held chiliast views were obligated to defend what to them was truth.[19] In another connection which dealt with admissions of pastors, the synod resolved to require recognition of non-church-separating open questions, but not adherence to the views upon them prevailing in its midst.[20]

It was not clearly understood at once either in the synod or outside of it that through these developments an Iowa Richtung divergent from that of Neuendettelsau was emerging. Previous agreement with the latter had been personal and taken for granted rather than official. The declarations of 1858 indeed made it appear that the official stamp had been supplied. Publication of the Synodalbericht 1858, which contained the two important doctrinal papers and notices in it that they had been unanimously adopted, were taken as evidence that synodical doctrines had been accepted agreeing entirely with the Neuendettelsau position. It is not at all surprising that doctrinal opponents of the synod accepted this interpretation. It will be noted that individuals and groups within the synod, who entered it in later days, also accepted this conclusion, which the documents seemed to substantiate. As just described, however, even in 1858 the synod itself did not take this view.

---

[19] K. B. III, 9, 69.

[20] Ibid., 7, 53.

Since all members of the convention of 1858 were in agreement with the doctrinal views expressed in the papers, these were approved and their publication ordered. When, however, the question of admission of men who did not share the chiliast views came up, no objections were raised.

Obviously there was a difference between the two papers of 1858 which was not clearly seen. Adoption of the position toward the symbols advocated in the first, committed the synod to a tolerant attitude on open questions. This action was deliberately taken and was meant to define the synodical stand. On this point the synod took a position similar to that of Neuendettelsau. When in 1860 it required applicants for admission to accept the essence of this position, this decision was clarified. Though changes in detail will later be noted, essentially the synod was to adhere to this position throughout its history. Once, however, this fundamental decision had been taken, the declaration on chiliasm could not be made a synodical doctrine without violating it, because open questions on which a right to dissent was acknowledged were involved. This point was obscured because both in Neuendettelsau[21] and in the synod there was unanimous agreement on the controverted points at the moment. Since controversy existed on chiliast doctrines, this unanimous agreement was presented to the church. If the synod took such action at all, it should have taken care to state that personal opinion of its members rather than an official position was presented, and to add that there was room in its midst for those who disagreed.

---

[21] It seems clear that the need for a differentiation between a stand on the symbols and one on chiliasm was sensed rather than thought through. While the willingness to admit members who dissented in the latter respect indicates that the synod saw that it could not consistently make chiliast convictions a binding synodical doctrine and in fact had no intention of doing so, the fact remains that through adoption and publication of the chiliast paper it gave the impression of doing just that. The example of Neuendettelsau, which maintained the toler-

Its failure to do so was to involve it in much controversy and difficulty. The action on admissions in 1858, however, makes it clear that despite appearances, chiliast opinions were not meant to be synodical doctrine. The action of 1860 officially marked the emergence of the specific Iowa Richtung. Emphasis now was placed upon a confessional position which adhered to the symbols as historically interpreted and recognized certain controverted doctrines as open and non-church-separating questions. Statements previously made on recognized open questions, church, ministry, chiliasm, were not to be regarded as synodical doctrines requiring assent of all members. They could be held and defended by its members, as could contrary opinions. Contending for the right of church

---

ant position on open questions and yet took a definite stand on chiliasm was probably a confusing factor. The difference of course was that the Gesellschaft was not a church and that the question of church fellowship did not arise in its midst. It was a voluntary gathering of adherents of Loehe's views with a relatively stable membership. When vacancies arose, e. g., in the staff at Neuendettelsau, successors could be selected and opponents of chiliasm rejected without violating the principle of toleration on open questions. The synod as a church could not do this, and remain faithful to its basic principles. It may be added that opponents of the synod, who judged its position from its publications, were not likely to be convinced through a practice on admissions which contradicted apparent documentary evidence. They were likely merely to consider such a practice unprincipled.

fellowship with other Lutherans of varying opinions on open questions, the synod freely extended it in its own midst. Unfortunately no synodical report was published in 1860 containing these clarifications. Statements in the Kirchenblatt seem not to have attracted the attention which the Synodalbericht 1858 had received. Their significance was either misinterpreted or ignored.

Even Neuendettelsau did not clearly understand that Iowa's Richtung had diverged from its own. A situation thus developed which made for misunderstanding and which eventually was seriously to jeopardize the relationship. American opponents continued to regard chiliasm as official synodical doctrine and the fact that, for a time, most Iowa pastors continued to defend the positions of 1858, while those who altered their position had a tendency to withdraw,[22] tended to lend color to the belief. Internally the synod consistently applied its principles and recognized the right of its members to differ on open questions. This meant, however, inevitably a degree of doctrinal dissension in its own midst, which sometimes led to withdrawal of dissident members and sometimes to the formation of factions.

---

[22] The withdrawals of Brand and Bauer in 1860 and of Burk in 1864 which have been noted in other connections may serve as examples. The case of Brand in particular illustrates the synodical Richtung. When Brand expressed doubts on this account, apparently chiefly on chiliast grounds, he was informed that he would not be excluded for such reasons. He, however, objected to the policy of toleration, calling it unionistic and indifferentistic and withdrew. See a letter, Brand - Grossmann, Swancreek, July 20, 1860, in I. S. D. and Chronik, 39, 40.

During the early sixties doctrinal controversy continued and the synodical conventions had occasion to reassert and to clarify the synodical position. In 1861 Grossmann dealt with charges leveled against the synod in a long synodical address which presented the position on the symbols and open questions, denied that it held specific chiliast views, but asserted that it regarded the Apocalypse as a prophetic book not yet fulfilled, and spoke of its doctrines on Church and ministry in terms which indicate that on this point, which was not at the time controversial within the synod, there still existed a synodical position.[23] A challenge to bring proof of errors in the symbols led a conference in 1862 to discuss a list of debatable statements, the chief result was that the confessional doctrine on Sunday observance was declared to be an open question.[24] The convention of 1864, which adopted the first synodical constitution, did not include the Richtungsparagraph of 1854, but indicated the Richtung in the paragraph on the confessional position. It also debated the controversial issues at great length with a dissident pastor and a representative of Missouri's point of view. As a result it issued an official statement which disclaimed any intention on the part of the convention of 1858 to make chiliasm a synodical doctrine, set forth the open question position on this point and asserted that the advocates of chiliast views in the synod were in full agreement with it.[25] The opponents, however, contended that the synod was altering its previous position. This view was thereafter tenaciously to be asserted and coupled with a demand for honest retractation of previous error.

---

[23] Synodalbericht 1861, 8-22.

[24] Chronik, 59, states that the paper was written in response to a challenge. Deindoerfer was chronicler at the time and submitted the paper in question. The challenge referred to was probably a statement in a rather violently phrased attack in Lutheraner XVIII, 10, 73-6, on p. 76. The paper itself was not found by the writer, the discussion of a portion of it is recorded in Protokollbuch, Minutes Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862. It listed five errors, the most important of which was the statement which named the pope as the anti-Christ. There were objections to all of them and in most cases qualifications were noted. The discussion then covered nine statements listed as doubtful, on which there was also much disagreement. Papers were to cover several of them in future sessions. The conclusion was that there were only minor imperfections mainly in theological demonstrations and that Lutherans might rejoice over this fact. The discussion had to be broken off for lack of time; Chronik, 59, indicates that about sixty criticisms had been listed. Rohrlack in his cited letter of resignation referred to this paper and subsequent references to it, in the Lutheraner, became the occasion for a rather heated altercation at the colloquy of 1867, Beyer, Colloquium, 121-6.

---

[25] In subsequent controversies the omission of the paragraph of 1854 was explained as being due to a conviction that the constitution was not the place for such a declaration, e. g., K. Z. I, 2, 50. It was still in the constitution for congregations and it was also maintained and defended in Denkschrift 10, citation, p. 6, discussion, 20-30. Paragraph 2 of the new constitution confessed adherence to all symbols, because the synod recognized their decisions in questions controverted before and during the Reformation as being in accordance with Scriptures. The confessional position was thus maintained without change, omission of the statement on progress and specific indication of Richtung does not seem to have meant that the synod wished to retreat in these respects, but rather that they were considered implied. Perhaps they were also intended to indicate that the synodical Richtung as understood in 1864 differed from that of Neuendettelsau.

The debate is reported Synodalbericht 1864, 29-35, the declaration follows, 35-7. The dissident pastor was F. Doederlein, the former missionary, who had come under Missouri influence in his charge at Jackson, Missouri. His companion was Prof. F. A. Schmidt, a member of the Norwegian Synod, which then held Missouri's convictions. He was then stationed at Decorah, Iowa, at Luther College, and later at St. Louis and was to remain a violent opponent of the Iowa Synod. Doederlein had long been in controversy with his synod, the development of which may be traced in Protokollbuch, Minutes, Min. Conf., Dubuque, August 7-11, 1862, and Ausschuss Minutes, December 14, 1861; August 14; September 29, 1862; April 13, 1863. For Missouri comments see Lehre und Wehre XI, 6, 176-87; 7, 200-212.

Missouri's attitude during these years settled down to a steady hostility. Iowa's position was attacked in its publications on every point. The tone used was usually offensive and the right of the synod to the name Lutheran was denied.[26] The Iowa Synod, lacking a theological magazine, used the Kirchenblatt occasionally to present its views or to reply to criticism, using harsh expressions now and then, but generally writing in a moderate tone during this period.[27] In the mid-sixties the enthusiasm for chiliast views showed a distinct tendency to die down. Even the confessional position began to be viewed with some doubt. A number of withdrawals occurred and, particularly in the east, signs of factional opposition began to appear. These were adjusted, but as a trend away from controversy and toward union began to manifest itself in the Lutheran Church throughout America, the synod began to feel that its position should be re-examined.[28]

---

[26] Lehre und Wehre, the theological magazine, in which controversial articles might be expected, after the first flare-up usually confined itself to citations from the Kirchenblatt, or German publications which it supplied with comments or denials, which occasionally were sharply sarcastic. Examples may be found, VII, 4, 123; 8, 228-35; IX, 8, 250; 10, 310-11; 313-14. Sharper attacks, often but not always, in reply to the Kirchenblatt occurred in the Lutheraner. Examples may be found, XVII, 17, 140-1; XVIII, 18, 73-6; XIX, 2, 9-13; 22, 174; 25, 195-6; XX, 2, 11-12; 14; 3, 17-19; 4, 25-6; 18, 141.

[27] K. B. IV, 10, 76-7; VII, 1, 3-6, may serve as examples of presentations of the synodical position; VII, 1, 1-2, stated the policy of the synodical organ, to reply only occasionally, because theological controversy was out of place in a popular church paper; VI, 8, 64, brings a reply to criticisms in the Lutheraner, which together with rejoinders are found in the citations in the last footnote. In the second of the K. B. citations here can be found an example of objection to offensive language. A reply is in Lutheraner, XX, 18, 141, the original statement in 3, 18. The Iowa statement which called it forth is in Synodalbericht 1861, 9.

Toward this end S. Fritschel made his second visit to Europe in 1866 for the primary purpose of obtaining opinions on the position of the synod from theological faculties and prominent theologians. The most thorough opinion obtained came from the faculty at Dorpat and was written by T. Harnack. In the main it found the position of the synod unobjectionable, but it pointed out that the theory of the historical interpretation of the symbols, with its emphasis on the thetical and anti-thetical decisions, might be employed to omit essential articles of faith which were mentioned only incidentally.[29] This point was more strongly emphasized in a second opinion from Muenkel. Taken together they criticized the theory of symbolical interpretation which the synod had followed and held that essential doctrines occuring in the symbols must be considered binding regardless of context, though they agreed with the synodical contention that not everything in the symbols without distinction could be considered essential and binding. Other and briefer opinions favorable in the main in character were obtained from Christiani, Guericke, Luthardt and Harless.[30]

---

[28] Letters, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Toledo, January 24; July 7; November 29, 1866, in I. S. D., refer to a rising tide of anti-chiliasm, express fears that it might split the synod and indicate that Doerfler had changed his stand on it entirely and now opposed it strongly. The letters also indicate that synodical consciousness in the Eastern Conference was weak, several of its members opposed a Richtung or inclined toward Missouri on specific points. The last letter describes a session of the conference in which the differences were threshed out and adjusted. A few years later another letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Toledo, February 6, 1869, also in I. S. D., emphasizes that the old trend toward Missouri had died out completely and that the east was now completely loyal. It was undoubtedly fortunate for the synod that Deindoerfer was stationed in the east and could bring it back into line. Chronik, 79, indicates that misgivings on the synod's position existed and that S. Fritschel's visit to Europe resulted from them.

The gathering of these opinions took place between the synodical conventions of 1864 and 1867 and it was therefore not possible to take official action on them until the latter convention met. Several important developments took place in the meantime outside of the synod, which were not without influence on its course. In 1866 internal dissension split the

---

[29] This opinion was published as a pamphlet, Gutachten der Dorpater theol. Facultaet ueber die von der deutschen evang.-luth. Synode von Iowa in Nord-Amerika ihr vorgelegten Fragen, den kirchlichen Lehrconsensus betreffend. It was dated Dorpat, October 15, 27, 1866, and signed by five members of the faculty. It may be noted that Iowa's position had always been only that not all doctrines incidentally occurring in expository and other sections could be considered binding.

[30] Guericke's opinion was not favorable and appeared Lehre und Wehre, XIII, 12, 362-7. That by Christiani was published in K. B. X, 3, 17-18, the others in Theologische Monatshefte, Muenkel, I, 9, 257-65; 10, 289-98; Luthardt, I, 11, 346-7; Harless, II, 2, 41-50; 3, 75-87. Comments, chiefly on their reception, including criticism in Lehre und Wehre XIII, 9, 257-71; XIV, 6, 190-4; appeared K. B.X, 5, 34-6; 6, 47-8; 9, 70-1; 10, 74-5.

Buffalo Synod. The majority of its members separated from Grabau and held a colloquy with Missouri, with the result that most of the members of this group joined that synod.[31] Also in 1866 the Pennsylvania Synod withdrew from the General Synod and initiated a movement for federation of independent Lutheran bodies with a conservative confessional position. The result was the organization of the General Council at a convention late in 1866 at which Iowa was represented.[32] The synod itself had in 1865 made a move toward a direct discussion of differences with Missouri, but had been rebuffed.[33]

---

[31] This event did not directly concern the Iowa Synod. The only official notice of it which came to the writer's attention was an open letter, Grossmann - Grabau, appealing for pacific settlement on the basis of toleration of non-essential differences, K. B. IX, 10, 75-7. In view of dissensions within the synod, however, this schism and its results may have contributed to the reconsideration of the position of the synod and the subsequent approach to Missouri. It may be noted that of former Iowans who had withdrawn and joined Buffalo, Bauer and Brand joined Missouri as did Grossberger, who had withdrawn from the seminary, while Burk remained loyal to Grabau. The remnant of the dissident von Rohr group after the colloquy maintained a separate existence for some time and broke up later, some of its members returning to Buffalo after Grabau's death. Habel's Bruderbund, which came from this group, has been mentioned earlier.

[32] Iowa's relationship to this body will be discussed in the next chapter. Grossmann's presidential report in 1867 expressed the opinion that Missouri might join the Council if Iowa were excluded. For that reason he thought, Iowa should attempt to settle its difficulties with Missouri. He had invited Walther to attend the convention to that end, President's report 1867 in I. S. D. Walther did not come.

[33] A general pastoral conference had been held at Altenburg in 1865, minutes for which are not extant. According to Chronik, 78, the chief subject for discussion was that of open questions in regard to which the position of the synod was approved. It may be that this conference suggested S. Fritschel's European

Controversy continued to rage in the church papers and Iowa now showed a strong tendency to outdo Missouri's tone, but in 1867 the synod began to see concessions and a ray of hope that that understanding might be reached after all.[34]

---

visit during the next year, but no indication of this has been found. Grossmann, both Fritschels, and Krebs made an attempt to see Walther at St. Louis on the way to the conference, but he was absent. Invited to call again on their return, they promised to do so and met him a week later, but were given no opportunity to discuss synodical differences, *K*. *B*. IX, 9, 70-1. What they wished specifically to discuss was a recent controversy over the doctrine of the anti-Christ, no doubt in relation to the open questions generally. See *Lutheraner*, XXI, 113-15; 21, 164; *K*. *B*. VIII, 6, 41-5. What Walther thought of Iowa at that time may be judged from a passage in *Lutheraner*, XXII, 1, 1:

> "Da steht ferner die aus Hierarchismus, Chiliasterei und etwas Wahrheit zusammengewuerfelte Iowasynode, und tritt neuerdings wieder kecker hervor mit ihren Anspruechen fuer ihre sogenannte historische, im Grunde aber hoechst unhistorische Auffassung der Symbole; und wenn sie so mit ihrer Scheinwisserei und ihrem Gelehrtum fortfaehrt, duerfte vielleicht bald eine ernstere, eingehendere Zurechtweisung not thun, wofern nicht die Gefahr zu gross ist, den jugendlichen Feind durch zu viel Beachtung nur uebermuetiger zu machen."

[34] See *Lutheraner* XXII, 16, and the article *K*. *B*. IX, 2, 15-16, which occasioned this outburst, for an instance of sheer hostility. Chiliasm was the subject of articles in *Lutheraner* XXIII, 12, 96; and another running through 14 and 15 and of a series begun in 18 and continued through XXIV, 10, 12, 13 and 14. An attack on the confessional position occurred in XXIII, 15, 122-5. Missouri had obtained a copy of the Conference paper of 1862 in which errors in the symbols had been considered and, after earlier mentions and answers in the *K*. *B*., Walther offered not to publish it, if Iowa would abandon its *quatenus* position, XXIII, 16, 126. A series of articles reviewing Iowa's position, with alternate moderate statements and the concessions of which Iowa took note and sharp attacks on alleged dishonest controversial methods and finally a reply to Iowa's rejoinder, ran through XXIII, 17, 20, 22, 23, 24 and XXIV, 1 and 2. The Iowa synod reply to the last series in in *K*. *B*. X, running through 3, 4 and 5. Concessions by Walther, author of the Missouri series, were noted in 10, 78-9. Hope was expressed that, if Walther would maintain them, agreement might be reached on both the confessional position and chiliasm. The reply

Meeting in this setting, the convention of 1867 considered the European opinions on its position gathered by S. Fritschel. It resolved to drop its theory of the historical interpretation with its assertion that the binding symbolical content was contained in the thetical and anti-thetical declarations. Instead the synod declared that it accepted all doctrines in the symbols which were confessionally stated or intended, but that not every statement in them could be considered as confessional and binding.[35] It may be noted

---

began, however, with an attack on Walther's method.

> "Dazu nimmt er zu den Mitteln der Verlaeumdung. Verdrehung, Faelschung und Unterschiebung in einem solchem Masse seine Zuflucht, dass man sich billig davor entsetzt." "... das er nur aus dieser sicheren Voraussetzung (that no reply would be made) die offenbaren Luegen, handgreiflichen Verdrehungen, heimtueckischen Insinuationen and leicht nachweisbaren Faelschungen und Untererschiebungen gewagt hat von denen seine Aufsaetze strotzen." (The author of these charges was S. Fritschel.)

A reprint of an article on the anti-Christ from Muenkel in 9, 66-9, brought Missouri protests, *Lutheraner* XXIV, 4, 29-30; 5, 38. It may also have occasioned a series on this subject after the colloquy had failed to reach agreement on it, running through numbers 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and a shorter one in 15 and 20, all of which were also reprinted from German sources.

[35] *Zusammenstellung* 1867 in I. S. D.; *Chronik*, 80. There are also two typewritten copies of portions of the minutes of 1867 in the I. S. D. One deals with the debate on this topic, the other with that on the theses on ecclesiastical unity which will be noted subsequently. The convention instructed S. Fritschel to write a letter of thanks to the authors of the opinions. *Zusammenstellung* 1867 with notes on enforcement indicates that this was done. On the significance of the change *Chronik*, 80, may be quoted:

> *Die Synode aenderte also ihre Bekenntnisstellung dahin, dass sie die gemachte Unterscheidung, in der Allgemein-*

that this action was not considered as changing the confessional position. A theory was dropped, which was held properly to belong into the realm of theological research rather than into the confessional declaration of a church body. In the future the position was usually stated as acceptance of all articles of faith in the confessions. This statement left room for differences of opinion on other points which continued to be considered open questions and non-church-separating.

Before the convention of 1867 came also a paper on the necessary basis for ecclesiastical unity, which had been developed at a conference during the preceding year.[36] It was

---

heit in welcher sie gemacht worden war, aufgab, ohne damit die sachliche Unterscheidung zwischen Verbindlichem und Nichtverbindlichem in den symbolischen Buechern aufzugeben. (Italics author's.)

Since the position had always been that not every doctrine in the incidental sections of the symbols could be considered binding, this did not mean that the synod now accepted anything that it had not previously accepted. This phrasing in itself indicates that the synod had previously understood that the distinction made was not perfect. When friendly criticism pointed up this weakness, a theory, of which it was clear that its implications had been much misunderstood by opponents, was readily abandoned.

[36] *Chronik*, 79, mentions the conference and attendance of two pastors of the Wisconsin Synod. Deindoerfer, *Geschichte*, 126, mentions a conference of the members of several local conferences in 1866 and also refers to the presence of several members of the Wisconsin Synod. Undoubtedly both references indicate the same meeting, for which no minutes were found. Deindoerfer refers to theses discussed as essentially the same as those of 1867. A type copy containing five theses, *Thesen ueber unsere Kirchliche Stellung aus Konferenzprotokoll* 1866, *McGregor*, *Iowa*, is in I. S. D. They defined open questions.

debated and adopted in nine theses as a confessional act.[37] Based on the *satis est* of the Augustana, they declared that the unity of the church was fundamental, related to the essential articles of faith, but not absolute, consisting of complete unity in all minor doctrines. An absolute unity had never existed and should not be required for church fellowship. A summary of essential doctrines on which there must be agreement was to be found in the symbols, but the agreement must not necessarily extend to non-essential doctrines incidentally mentioned in the symbols.[38]

Taking advantage of the fact that the northern district of the Missouri Synod was simultaneously in session nearby at Adrian, Michigan, the convention resolved to send two delegates to it with a letter inviting the Missouri body to appoint delegates for the purpose of holding a colloquy at

---

[37] *Zusammenstellung* 1867 in I. S. D. *Chronik*, 81. Both use the word *Bekenntnisakt*. *Chronik* indicates that they were considered with reference to the controversy with Missouri, and opposed to its demand for absolute unity. *K. B.* X, 8, 61, reported that they summed up a paper by S. Fritschel. The paper was published, *Theologische Monatshefte*, I,1,17-25; 2, 47-55; 3, 83-92; 4, 97-109.

[38] Under the title, *Was ist zur kirchlichen Einigkeit noetig*, the theses are printed in Deindoerfer, *Geschichte*, 127-8. In view of the turn which the open question controversy was to take later, thesis 8 may be quoted: "Demnach liegt in den Symbolen die Summe von Lehren vor, in denen notwendig Lehruebereinstimmung stattfinden muss." *Chronik*, 81, notes: "Dazu wurde bemerkt, dass die Bekenntnisse nicht alle Lehren enthalten, aber voraussetzen, dass die gemein christlichen Lehren geglaubt werden." It would have been wise to incorporate this sentence.

Toledo while the convention was still in session. The letter stated that Iowa had become concerned about doing something to promote peace, so that the synods could carry on their work alongside of each other harmoniously. Since doctrinal writing had not promoted peace, a personal meeting to discuss differences might help toward healing the deplorable schism. If no full agreement on all points could be attained immediately, it might be help sharply to define the points of controversy in friendly discussion. The delegates met with a friendly reception, but the district declared itself incompetent to accept the invitation. It expressed approval of the colloquy, however, and promised to recommend it to the other district synods. If they agreed Walther would confer with Iowa on the arrangements. The convention then provided for holding the colloquy on these terms and chose delegates to represent the synod.[39]

---

[39] The account given follows Chronik, 82, which also gives Grossmann and the two Fritschels as the designated participants and notes that the Missouri reply was not altogether satisfactory, since it implied that this was Iowa's first gesture toward peace, and that peace would depend on adoption of the Missourian viewpoints. The account also notes, that without a formal resolution it was understood that the theses on unity should determine Iowa's position in the negotiations, Zusammenstellung 1867 in I. S. D. gives a summary of the proceedings and adds a few details on the arrangements. Time and place were to be published in the Kirchenblatt and Grossmann was authorized to call a special convention or pastoral conference after the colloquy. This was not done at once, but the convention of 1868 was a special meeting. Also in I. S. D. is Beilage No. 4 zum Synodalprotocoll 1867 which contains the reply of the Missouri district convention, signed Ottomar Fuerbringer. K. B. X, 8, 63, reports the arrangements and gives G. Fritschel and Klindworth as the delegates sent to Adrian.

Although the controversy in the church papers, to which reference has been made, continued without interruption or change of tone, the arrangements were carried through and the colloquy was held in Milwaukee in November 1867.[40] Missouri considered chiliasm the very heart of Iowa's alleged aberrations and wished to discuss that point first, while Iowa insisted that its position on the symbols was basic. It was not until the second session that agreement was reached to proceed with the latter issue.[41] The discussions on the symbols were extended and led to a measure of agreement. Both parties accepted a statement that all doctrines of faith in the symbols were binding. Both also agreed that non-fundamental doctrines occurred in them and that these were not binding. This consensus, however, left the real question open, which doctrines must be considered binding doctrines of faith? Missouri's understanding was that only doctrines could be excepted, which were not based on Scriptures. Iowa's position was that doctrines not clearly and unmistakably revealed in Scriptures, with the result that no consensus on them existed in the Lutheran Church, were not binding. The controversy came to center on the symbolical doctrine that under the New Testament Sunday observance is no longer a divine mandate. The Iowa representatives declared their personal agreement with this symbolical position, but maintained that lack of consensus among Lutheran theologians indicated lack of unmistakable scriptural revelation, and that therefore this doctrine must be considered an open question. Missouri was not willing to go so far as to hold that theologians who differed from the symbols on this point, were not Lutherans, but it insisted that the question was not open and to make it so would impair confessional solidarity.[42] The synods thus agreed on a formula to express symbolical fidelity and on the existence of open questions, though Missouri preferred to call them problems. Missouri insisted, however, on confining them within very narrow limits, while Iowa included controversial doctrines, resting on disputed exegesis, if they did not touch the foundation of faith.

---

[40] The colloquy was held in a Wisconsin Synod church, November 13-19. The representatives of Missouri were Pastors Walther, Sihler, Hochstetter, Huegli and laymen K. Koch, C. Wassermann, F. Stutz, G. Bierlein. To the Iowa delegation already named, layman F. Becker had been added. Twelve sessions were held between Wednesday noon and Tuesday noon, usually lasting three hours or more. The regular schedule called for morning and afternoon sessions, but there were none on Sunday, while evening sessions were held on Friday and Monday. The agenda were not completed, because the Iowa delegates had to leave for a convention of the General Council. While the results are summarized, *Chronik*, 85, the official source is a pamphlet, *Oeffentliches Colloquium abgehalten vom 13. bis sum 19. November A. D. 1867 in der Ev. Luth. Dreieinigkeitskirche zu Milwaukee, Wisc., zwischen den Vertretern der Ev. Luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio und anderen Staaten und der Ev. Lutherischen Synode von Iowa*. This pamphlet, which will be cited as *Oeffentliches Colloquium* contains resolutions, the officially submitted mutual criticisms, and the final declarations. Both sides had secretaries and stenographers. The Missouri stenographer, Pastor J. P. Beyer, subsequently published, *Stenographisch aufgezeichnetes Colloquium der Vertreter der Synode von Iowa und der von Missouri, Ohio u. a. St.* This will be cited as Beyer, *Colloquium*. It purports to be a faithful record of the debates so far as the author attended them. Iowa subsequently repudiated this account entirely as a biassed and partisan report, *K. B.* XI, 14, 110-11. Beyer's reply challenged the accuracy of Iowa stenographic notes, but was written in a tone which would seem to substantiate the charge of partisanship, *Lutheraner* XXV, 1, 5.

---

[41] Iowa's insistence was in part due to an earlier Missouri statement that Lutherans dealt with Lutherans on basis of the symbols, with non-Lutherans on basis of Scriptures. S. Fritschel was willing to yield but Grossmann took a tenacious stand, Oeffentliches Colloquium, 1-2; Beyer, Colloquium, 14-26. Iowa agreed not to break off the discussions before chiliasm had been considered.

In the discussion on chiliast doctrines, Iowa admitted freely that various expressions used by it in the past, could be understood as Missouri had understood them and that, if so interpreted, they constituted crass and anti-confessional, unscriptural chiliasm. It denied, however, that it had meant them as they had been understood and gladly retracted such expressions. It held fast to the prophetic character of Apocalypse 20, but, referring to its declaration of 1864, denied all crass ideals concerning the millennium and forbore giving positive descriptions. The return of Christ to destroy the anti-Christ was understood to be passing, the first resurrection was a restricted one, comparable to the resurrections at Christ's death. Missouri conceded that a prophetic conception of Apocalypse 20 was not heresy, though it considered it false, partially conceded the possibility of a passing return of Christ, but rejected a first resurrection as contrary to the analogy of faith.[43] No agreement at all could be reached in regard to the anti-Christ, Missouri maintaining inflexibly, that this scriptural prediction was fulfilled in the papacy.[44] While differences on the ministry were also on the agenda, they could not be discussed for lack of time.[45]

---

[42] Oeffentliches Colloquium, 2-17. From the extended debate as reported by Beyer, Colloquium, the sections dealing with the Sunday question may be cited, 90-4; 104-20. Iowa declared the Sunday doctrine to be the only one of its kind in the symbols which they considered open. They agreed to substitute Problems for open questions and reluctantly also to require a listing of symbolical doctrines, not acceptable to the applicant, at the time of ordination. Since the colloquy did not end the controversy, these agreements never came into force. Missouri's previous concession which had led Iowa to hope that agreement might be reached had consisted of an acknowledgment that not every symbolical statement was unconditionally binding.

The discussions seem in the main to have been polite, but despite concessions they did not lead to full agreement, and undercurrents of antagonism and suspicion seem to have run through them.[46] The two opponents had been able to establish common ground in certain respects and to define the area of disagreement in others. The formula agreed upon in regard to the binding character of the symbols did not help much, since no agreement had been reached on open questions. Missouri did not deny in the abstract that there were such, but it did not consider them to include doctrines on Sunday observance, the anti-Christ, and probably not those on the transference theory which was not discussed. Some chiliast beliefs might be so classed, but not all of them as Iowa contended. Though Missouri had been unwilling to assert that any one of these differences was cause for the denial of church fellowship, its establishment between the two synods had not even been discussed.

---

[43] Oeffentliches Colloquium, 21-23. Scheduled for Saturday morning, discussion on chiliasm did not begin until well into the afternoon.

[44] Ibid., 25-6; 31-2; Beyer, Colloquium, 127-58 deals with chiliast conceptions, 159-68 with the anti-Christ. Iowa asserted strongly that it had not meant to make chiliasm a synodical doctrine in 1858, but had been moved to make a declaration by current rumors as to what was actually being taught in the synod. It may be observed that according to Beyer, G. Fritschel doubted whether in 1867 chiliasm was still accepted by a majority in the synod and S. Fritschel, stated that he wished it were, p. 130.

[45] Oeffentliches Colloquium, 30-31.

[46] This impression is derived from Beyer, Colloquium, which may here reflect the author's prejudices. A footnote in his account, p. 44, calls attention to an omission, which as his later statement, Lutheraner XXV, 1, 5, indicates,

Both sides expressed hopes as the colloquy ended that the rapprochement which had been begun, might be extended and that unity might yet be achieved.[47] Such hopes were

---

referred to an instance when S. Fritschel lost his temper and gave Walther the lie. On p. 175 he notes an apology by S. Fritschel to Walther which seems to refer to the statements quoted in footnote 34 and records an ungracious reply which brushed off the apology. Such incidents, were exceptional, but the tone often seems to have grown sharp. The last statements, p. 175, refer to an understanding to carry on future controversy in theological magazines rather than in church papers, but the statements are not conclusive. Chronik, 85, refers to agreement to avoid personal attacks in future controversy. Neither was observed.

[47] See Missouri's final declaration, Oeffenliches Colloquium, 32, which found an echo, Lutheraner XXIV, 16, while Iowa expressed similar sentiments, K. B. X, 12, 96. In an introductory editorial for Vol. XI the editor again asserted such hopes, but added that Iowa would not permit the analogy

destined for disappointment. The results of the colloquy were rather thoroughly discussed in the *Kirchenblatt*, no effort being made to conceal the differences which remained, while due emphasis was given to the degree of agreement achieved.[48] Some influential members seem to have thought that Iowa had conceded too much.[49] The convention of 1868, already aware of Missouri reactions yet to be noted, gave some attention to the declarations made by Iowa's representatives at the colloquy, but voted to refer the matter to the conferences and to give a synodical judgment at the following convention.[50]

---

of faith to be unduly narrowed or requirements for unity unduly broadened, 1, 2.

[48] It may be noted that the source last cited listed the colloquy as one of the notable events of the preceding year. *K.B.* X, 12, 96, gave a brief general appraisal, XI, 1, 3-5; 2, 11-13; 3, 21-22; 4, 27-31, gave a fuller account. It may also be noted that this account substantiates Beyer, *Colloquium*, 130, in pointing out that Iowa was ready to withdraw the allegation of indubitable certainty of 1858 for expectations of a first resurrection and a double visible return of Christ, p. 22.

[49] Letters, Fuehr - Grossmann, Berea, March 17, 1868; January 7, 1869; Dietz - Grossmann, Tete des Morts, March 14, 1868; Deindoerfer - Klindworth, Toledo, March 3, 1868, in I. S. D., all indicate lack of enthusiasm or the feeling that too much had been conceded. Deindoerfer's letter indicates that Klindworth felt so too and had aired adverse views. The confessional formula seemed useless to Deindoerfer without agreement on what were open questions and not ideal in itself, and he seemed to feel that chiliast views had been practically abandoned and objected to the listing of points of disagreement with the symbols.

[50] *Zusammenstellung* 1868 in I. S. D. There was also a paper on the undiscussed differences on church and ministry, which received but little attention. A reply in the *K. B.* to *Lutheraner* attacks was ordered. *K. B.* XI, 22, 169-70.

No further action was ever taken.[51] It is possible that Neuendettelsau objections to colloquy concessions may also have influenced the synod. The German fathers had begun to realize that the Iowa Richtung no longer was identical with its own. They may have feared that Iowa was preparing to surrender to Missouri and seem for a time to have considered breaking off the relationship and beginning a new enterprise of their own. At one time they actually had decided to send their men only to the Eastern Conference, an action of which that conference itself did not approve, as harmful to synodical unity. The strain was relieved for a time and it is possible that the decision of the convention of 1869 to send S. Fritschel to Europe for a third time, may have been motivated by a desire to adjust these difficulties.[52] While cooperation was soon

---

indicates that the postponement of ratification of colloquy results was due to poor attendance of the convention, but there was also resentment over subsequent Missouri misrepresentation of Iowa's position on open questions.

[51] K. M., N. F. II, 1, 8, noted that the conferences had discussed the colloquy, but that the convention of 1869 tabled the matter. Chronik, 91, reports that Bauer had submitted a resolution on the colloquy, but that because of poor attendance the convention had decided not to consider it at that session. No further action is recorded.

[52] In a letter, Bauer - Deindoerfer, Neuendettelsau, June 1, 1868, in I. S. D., the former had indicated his awareness that chiliast doctrines in Iowa were on a basis of toleration and indicated that he too considered this as a change from 1858. The letter was not resentful, but held that the present position would be found untenable. In a later letter, undated and unaddressed in I. S. D., but clearly written in the later sixties, Bauer discussed the differences in Richtung and indicated that he thought the leaders faithful, but the rank and file indifferent. He mentioned both of the courses indicated in the text, but spoke of them as phases through which

restored, a distrust had been created, which in a few years was to lead to greater misunderstandings, before it could be cleared away.

If, however, the attitude of the synod toward the results of the colloquy was affected by German disapproval and misgivings in its own midst, the subsequent course of Missouri was clearly the major factor in determining its policy. That synod had never given the colloquy great prominence in its organ[53] and it hardly can be said to have greatly altered its tone or its policy of controversy as a result of it.[54]

---

he had passed. The invitations to him to visit America in 1869 and 1870, which have been discussed elsewhere, undoubtedly were due to this strain and may have helped to adjust it. Letters from Fuehr and Deindoerfer of early 1869 already cited refer to this strain, but the clearest references are in a letter, Kroenke - --, Riga, May 1, 1869, which indicates that Deindoerfer had been adjusting matters and that the Eastern Conference had no wish to develop itself at the expense of the synod. It has been noted elsewhere that S. Fritschel was to invite Bauer to America, but Chronik, 92, gives the establishment of relationships in northern Germany, where those with Missouri had become strained, as the major purpose.

[53] Only an inconspicuous announcement of the colloquy had been made in Lutheraner, XXIII, 22, 175. In the same way only a brief notice appeared XXIV, 7, 56, after it had been held. The preceding colloquy with a Buffalo faction had received much more attention, XXIII, 4, 28; 8, 57-8. It is true of course that the outcome on that occasion had been a victory and a considerable gain. Lehre und Wehre had commented on the colloquy, XIII, 9, 272-5, but had chiefly protested any need of clarifying issues on the ground that they were clear enough. It had also protested against the language applied to Walther cited in footnote 34, though its own columns had on occasion given offense, cf. XI, 11, 347-50.

[54] The tone of most of the controversial articles was moderate and inoffensive for some time afterward, but as early as July 1, 1868, a sharp and sarcastic reply to an article by G. Fritschel in Theologische Monatshefte, which referred to

Missouri soon made it clear that it still had a considerable number of objections to Iowa's position and soon was attacking particularly that on the anti-Christ and that on the open questions.[55] On the latter point the issues were often misrepresented with charges that Iowa demanded official action of the church on scriptural doctrines, before they could be accepted and with references both to unionism and to papism. Iowa soon felt itself driven to reply and before long controversy had again become general.[56] Hostility between the

---

the synod as "die Iowanesen," appeared Lutheraner XXIV, 21, 165. The term was again used, probably by Walther himself, XXV, 1, 1. There was also a reference to Sam. Fritschel in 9, 70, which may have been a misprint. It will be noted that the offensive reply in the Lutheraner was directed against an article in a theological magazine, where it had no doubt been published in accordance with the agreement at the colloquy. Lutheraner, XXV, 2, 12-13, replied to an article on chiliasm by Schieferdecker in the same place and added a query whether the Iowans now wrote there in order to spare their own readers.

[55] Lutheraner XXIV, 12, 92, brought a sharp protest against circulation of the Kirchenblatt accounts of the colloquy in Missouri as sneaking propaganda and a renewal of hostilities and cited Luther against such practices. (K. B. XI, 5, 40, replied that sample copies of the enlarged edition had been circulated with invitations to subscribe.) In 16, a contributor pointed out the controversies that remained after the colloquy. Several series on the anti-Christ have been noted in footnote 34. On open questions besides sources already noted, comments or articles appeared, XXV, 1, 1, 2; 6, 40-2; 7, 49-51, 51-2; 13, 99-100; 14, 105-6; 17, 129-30; 21, 161-3; 22, 166; 24, 189-90. Several of these referred specifically to the controversy over the Sunday doctrine. Lehre und Wehre brought discussions of open questions: XIII, 11, 310-16; XIV, 1, 1-4; 2, 33-9; 3, 65-70; 4, 100-114; 5, 129-41; 6, 161-9; 7, 201-11; 8, 233-40; 10, 294-305 and 318-9; XV, 12, 353-60; XVIII, 5, 142-57; XX, 2, 45-7.

[56] Besides replies on various points already noted, K. B. XI, 5, 33-6 reprinted an article from Lehre und Wehre which seemed to seek understanding and later replied on open questions 19, 151-2; XII, 3, 24; XIII, 5, 37-39. Theologische Monatshefte, I brought the article on church unity already

synods therefore was only slightly abated for a brief moment and soon flared as fiercely as ever. Practically it was apt to find expression in quarrels over congregations or even opposition altars. The situation in Dubuque may illustrate this point. In 1865 a small faction there had become embittered over questions of pastoral practice and had asked Missouri to supply it with a pastor before formal withdrawal from the congregation. Though pastoral service had been denied under those circumstances, the group had been advised to withdraw for doctrinal reasons. Though Iowa had protested vigorously, Missouri had supplied the opposition altar thus created. Bad blood caused by this case was still simmering after the colloquy, the principle on which it was based being ominous and infuriating from Iowa's point of view. During the next few years other congregational clashes kept occurring.[57]

---

cited. The Sunday question was discussed, III, 1, 19-32; 2, 33-41; 11, 321-54; V, 4, 105-28; 5, 129-51. An article on open questions, appeared VI, 4, 97-108; 5, 151-9; 6, 161-6. These were all by Iowans, the Missouri point of view was also occasionally presented.

[57] From materials bearing on the Dubuque controversy the following may be cited: Iowa's side was presented *K. M.* 1866, 5, 17-19; 6, 21-4; Missouri's viewpoint was given *Lutheraner* XXV, 10, 73-75; a letter, Buenger - --, St. Louis, October 26, 1865, in I. S. D., advised the local pastor that Missouri could withdraw only if he disavowed a number of Iowa's erroneous teachings; a copy of *Enderklaerung der Missouri-Committee*, undated with copied signatures of three prominent Missouri pastors in I. S. D., justified Missouri's conduct on the ground that, called in by local people, it was necessary to point out errors in doctrine of which they had not been aware, just as if they had been similarly called into a non-Lutheran situation. Of other cases those in Defiance, Ohio, and Keokuk Junction, Illinois, have already been mentioned. A situation in Davenport, which like Dubuque was to cause trouble for a long time, was discussed, *Lutheraner* XXVI, 21, 162-4; *K. B.* XIII, 8, 63.

In the doctrinal controversies after the colloquy, Iowa no longer confined itself to a definition of open questions on its own account and defense of them against attack, but it also undertook to attack on its own account Missouri positions which it held to be erroneous. The most prominent instance of this kind was the usury question. Missouri had in its own circles undertaken to revive the medieval position that collection of interest on loan contracts was usury and contrary to Scriptural injunctions and the law of Christian love. Iowa took the position that this doctrine was an open question, but its attitude in this case was that the Missouri position was wrong. For this reason it undertook to attack the Missouri contentions strongly and persistently.[58] Missouri found it difficult to attain the internal unanimity on

---

Lutheraner XXIII, 22, 172-4, refers to a Missouri situation which Iowa seems to have been willing to adjust only if Missouri yielded in Dubuque. Hostility also appears clearly in a case of student transfer from Wartburg to St. Louis discussed, K. B. XII, 1, 6-8; 22, 172; Lutheraner, XXV, 12, 89-91; 16, 126; XXVI, 7, 53.

[58] Since the usury question was primarily an internal controversy within the Missouri Synod, reference may be made in general terms to its presentation of its point of view in Lehre und Wehre, particularly XII, 10 and 11, 325-63, synodical reports at the end of the sixties and pamphlets. In answer to Iowa attacks the Lutheraner occasionally carried articles setting forth the salient features, e. g., XXV, 18, 137-40; 19, 145-7, or attacking Iowa arguments, XXVI, 23, 179-80. Life insurance was attacked, XXVI, 18, 139-41. Iowa ran a series of articles on the question in K. B. XII, 13, 14, 15 and 16, and discussed developments in Missouri in 20, 157-8. Chiefly the Iowa attack on Missouri's contention was carried on in Theologische Monatshefte, where articles appeared, II, 2, 33-40; 3, 60-75; 4, 97-100; 5, 129-40, which published a conference paper, and II, 7, 211-14; 9, 268-79; 10, 289-99; III, 3, 65-82; 4, 97-110; 5, 129-32; 8, 248-51.

the usury question, which it had been able to maintain in other controversial issues. No doubt this was due in considerable part to lay resistance to a doctrine with such far-reaching implications. In 1871 Walther conceded that a differentiation must be made between doctrines of faith and scriptural doctrines which were not such, and that church fellowship need not be denied to those who were in error only in the latter respect.[59] Iowa maintained thereafter that Missouri by this concession had agreed to its basic contention and that the way was now open to full agreement, unless Missouri wished to designate the various controversial doctrines as doctrines of faith.[60] Since, however, Missouri evaded this point consistently and continued to attack the open question position which it held to cloak Iowa rejections of doctrines of faith, the concession had no real effect on the controversy.

---

[59] Lutheraner XXVII, 17, 131. Missouri still contended that the usury doctrine was a scriptural doctrine, which Iowa as well as opponents within Missouri denied. Missouri thus conceded the point which Iowa had made at the colloquy, that doctrines not revealed in Scriptures with unmistakable clarity should not be church-separating. Walther, however, specifically denied that the usury doctrine was to be called an open question and thus persisted in giving that term a different meaning, with the implication that the Iowa open question position invalidated doctrines of faith. He also wrote that toleration must depend on whether the opposition showed by its conduct that it was honestly in doubt, or whether it was in rebellion against Scriptures.

[60] In the Davenport theses of 1873, yet to be noted, Iowa asserted directly that Missouri had dropped its own principle and adopted Iowa's. The strongest assertion of the difference in regard to what were doctrines of faith was made in a long footnote, K. Z. II, 4, 112-13.

It may be noted that a more serious controversy was foreshadowed when Missouri theologians began to take a position on predestination, from which Iowa not only differed, but which it did not hold to be an open question, because it considered this a doctrine of faith. This was destined to become the most serious difference between the synods and, after Missouri had fully developed its stand, was to bring Iowa's demand for church fellowship to an end, because this difference was considered church-separating. However, during the period under consideration no official declaration of position by Missouri took place and fuller consideration of this controversy may therefore be postponed.[61]

It has already been noted that in 1871 a convention resolved that controversy in the Kirchenblatt against Missouri was to be discontinued. While this resolution reflected a conviction that it was under existing circumstances almost hopeless to attain recognition of church fellowship from

---

[61] An article on predestination was published K. B. XVI, 4, 50-1; in 12, 13, 92-3 a brief reference called it a fundamental error and stated that if it were really accepted, Missouri could no longer be recognized as Lutheran. In Theologische Monatshefte, Iowa articles on predestination ran through V, 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8 and, after replies in subsequent numbers, another article ran through VI, 1 and 2. Related questions on justification and conversion were discussed II, 7, 9, 10, 11 and 12; IV, 1 and after a reply in 4 also in 11. Missouri's contentions need not be documented in detail at this point, Lehre und Wehre XVII, 6, 160-83; XVIII, 5, 129-42, brought articles which occasioned the objections. Little on the questions appeared in the Lutheraner, but a set of theses in XXVI, 16, 122 may be noted and a complaint by Walther on the policy of Theologische Monatshefte in 15, 117-8 which also commented on an error in the K. B. article on the subject which was corrected K. B. XVI, 10, 77-8.

Missouri, the editor disagreed and launched instead a campaign of defense, or criticism of Missouri's polemical methods, and also of its aberrations in the usury and predestination questions and of demands for recognition.[62] Editor Hoerlein failed completely to gain concessions or promote understanding, but merely drew attacks upon himself.[63] As a result the next convention renewed the injunction of silence and accepted Hoerlein's resignation.[64]

---

[62] Editor Hoerlein wrote much of his material himself and also accepted contributions. Among the latter in addition to the article on predestination already cited, were a plea for Lutheran unity, K. B. XV, 18, 138-9; a paper on the anti-Christ controversy, with which he did not fully agree, XVI, 11, 80-87 and documentary material on the usury controversy, XVI, 16, 122-3; 17, 133-4; 18, 139-40. Of his own contributions the following may be noted: XV, 5, 37-9; 9, 68-70; 17, 133; a series on the controversial questions of the day beginning XV, 20, 153-4 and running through 23, 24, XVI, 4, 10, 12, 13; a preface to Vol.XVI, 1, 1-2; 2, 9-11; 3, 17-18; a final declaration XVI, 10, 79-80 and a statement of his purposes and notice of synod's resolution of 1873 that the controversy be discontinued, 12, 13, 96-7.

[63] Walther in Lutheraner XXVII, 10, 89-90, replying to criticism from another source, maintained that mild polemics were in place only against those who sinned through weakness or ignorance. Pretense and puffed-up conceit must be made to blush and to appear rediculous. Proof of the latter attitude existed when arguments were met by evasion, distortion and slander. Iowa was not mentioned, but the latter charges were sometimes levelled against the synod. Replies to Hoerlein may be found XXVII, 24, 189; XXIX, 10, 76; 13, 100; 14, 108-9; 17, 133; 19, 142. Some of these refer to a brief reply K. B. XIV, 17, 128. For answer Hoerlein might have referred to Lutheraner XXV, 8, 62. Another reply not directed at Hoerlein XXVIII, 4, 29-30 may also be noted. Still others appeared in Lehre und Wehre, XVIII, 4 and 8.

[64] Hoerlein died before he was relieved of his office. Little direct controversy was carried on the K.B. the next two years, church news replacing controversial articles. Some of them, however, referred to conflicts of Missourian members or adherents with various churches in Germany and thus reflected the controversy.

When the convention of 1873 had the new synodical constitution under consideration, several members proposed that a change be made in the wording of the confessional paragraph. In 1864 that part of the original statement of 1854 which recognized the symbols, and did so because the synod wished to recognize the binding character of all the symbolical decisions in earlier controversies, had been retained. It was now proposed to substitute a simpler statement taken from the ordination formula which recognized the symbols as the pure and unadulterated exposition and explanation of the divine Word and will. Some opposition arose on the ground that such a change might be interpreted as change of position on the part of the synod. The proponents, however, specifically denied such an intention and indicated that they considered the proposed formulation clearer and more comprehensive, but in no sense contradictory. The alteration thus was adopted with the understanding that no change of position was intended, but it was not to be long until just that interpretation was to be made.[65]

---

[65] The stricken clause read "...weil sie die saemmtlichen symbolischen Entscheidungen der vor und in der Reformationszeit aufgekommenen Streitfragen als dem goettlichen Wort entsprechend erkennt." The substituted formulation read, "...als zu der reinen und ungefaelschten Darlegung und Erklaerung des goettlichen Wortes und Willens." The presentation is based on a portion of the minutes of the convention of 1873 printed in _K. Z._ I, 6, 179-81. Schieferdecker and Klindworth were the chief proponents of the change, the latter declaring that no change of position was intended. No objections were raised. Kroenke and Doehler supported the change. Deindoerfer, S. Fritschel and Hoerlein, were more or less opposed, the latter expressing the fear of misinterpretation. Grossmann

The convention of 1873 also considered a series of theses on the controversies with Missouri, since a statement on this subject had been requested in the interest of younger pastors, who had not taken part in the entire development.[66] The theses pointed out that there had been differences originally in regard to church and ministry and stated the differences, with the assertion that Missouri had since so changed its position in regard to the church, that no difference remained, while the transference theory remained controversial. The older controversy on the position toward the symbols was explained, the mutual concessions of 1867 noted and the agreement on the binding character of all doctrines of faith presented. The contrast between the Missouri contention that the doctrine recognizing the pope as the anti-Christ was a doctrine of faith and the Iowa position which recognized the papacy as anti-christic in character, but left open the appearance of a personal anti-Christ, was set forth. It was noted that the synod had no official chiliast doctrine, but that it believed that a millennium was yet to come and that its character was not under dispute with Missouri. The chief difference

---

indicated that the change logically followed on the change in confessional theory adopted in 1867. It may be observed that an undated and unsigned typewritten excerpt of the minutes of 1864 in I. S. D. indicates that Schieferdecker and Klindworth had then advocated striking the old *Richtungsparagraph* and were supported by G. Fritschel, but opposed by S. Fritschel.

[66] *K*. *B*. XVI, 22, 171-2 reported that the Northern Iowa Conference had asked for such a statement for the reason given. S. Fritschel had been instructed by Grossmann to prepare the theses. It was pointed out that formulation of Missouri's position must be subject to correction by that

remaining in this area was Missouri's rejection of a first resurrection, while Iowa, taking no official position, could see no heresy in the belief in the possibility of a partial, preliminary resurrection. Open questions had recently been the center of controversy. Iowa recognized non-church-separating differences of opinion on questions not touching the foundation of faith and not revealed with unmistakable clearness in the Scriptures, without thereby treating the questions themselves with indifference. Missouri had maintained that only such questions were open on which Scriptures contained nothing at all, but had recently changed this position and adopted Iowa's principle.[67]

These theses could not be discussed at length, but the convention ordered them printed in its report. It also gave the president authority to arrange for another discussion with Missouri, should that become advisable.[68] In this provision there appears a hint that a faction was in process of formation which wished to approach Missouri once more. There is no clear evidence that such a group was already active,

---

synod. Controversy on usury was omitted, a reference was made to predestination, but not in the theses. This controversy was as yet confined to individuals. Should Missouri officially adopt the positions presented by its leaders, the entire attitude of Iowa toward Missouri would have to change.

[67] The Davenport theses, as they were usually called, and will be in future references to them, are printed, Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 131-6. Missouri had changed its position on the church in the Buffalo colloquy in 1867. In justification of the assertion that Missouri had adopted Iowa's views on open questions, the entire Lutheraner statement was incorporated.

[68] Beschluesse 1873 in I. S. D. Opportunity was given to consider the correctness of the presentation and a few

though there are occasional references to advocates of the Missouri Richtung as tolerated in the synod with others. During the next two years such a group was, however, to become active and in 1875 it was to precipitate the crisis of that year. The Davenport theses and more particularly the change in the confessional paragraph were destined to be viewed with alarm at Neuendettelsau, which thought that the synod had changed its position, veering away from the fathers and toward Missouri, and this too was to have its bearing on the crisis of 1875.

While these ominous developments were under way, the synod was gravely concerned with the relocation of its seminary and with its college problem, so that the leadership may have been distracted somewhat from doctrinal controversy. The suspension of Theologische Monatshefte left it without a forum for theological discussions and the Kirchenblatt remained generally silent in accordance with the reasserted policy of 1871. Missouri, no doubt aware of dissensions in the Iowa camp, proceeded to bring up heavy artillery. In 1874 and 1875 its Lutheraner printed several series of long articles by Prof. A. Schmidt, professing to examine Iowa's position on basis of documents and records. Schmidt contended that Iowa's progress position demanded its open question theory, according to which all doctrines not symbolically fixed must

---

formal changes were made. There was no invitation to another colloquy, but the resolution made it possible to arrange for one, should the controversy take a turn which made that course advisable.

be considered as open and the number of those so fixed must be whittled down. If Iowa denied that this was actually its position, it was misrepresenting the facts and the writer professed to prove that from the documents. Iowa also misrepresented Missouri's position in order to be able to claim that Missouri had now adopted its own. Here too documents were cited to prove that this was not true. Iowa was dishonest, it had been dishonest from the beginning, had twisted and distorted its stand, had changed it and then denied changing it and was still doing so in regard to the changes of 1873. Apart from doctrinal differences, Missouri could not deal with leaders of treacherous and dishonest character. What was needed was repudiation of dishonest leadership and honest confession of past error. An appeal was made to honest elements in Iowa to deal with this situation.[69] An indirect reply[70] only brought renewed attacks, which were still continuing as the synod gathered for the convention of 1875.

---

[69] The Schmidt articles, together with another series yet to be noted, were reprinted later and issued as a pamphlet, which the writer has not seen. The original articles appeared Lutheraner XXX, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 under the heading, Ein Beitrag zur Pruefung der sogenannten "Missverstaendnisse" zwischen Iowa und Missouri. A sequel appeared 24, 187-90 under the title, Wie lange wollen die Iowaer ihr unlauteres, falsches Spiel fortsetzen, in reply to K. B. comments on Missouri policies in Germany. An indirect reply drew a third outburst, XXX, 7, 8, 9, 10 under the heading, Zur Beleuchtung der neuesten Iowaischen Bemaentelungsversuche.

[70] The reply is in K. B. XVII, 15, 115-17; 16, 122-3; 17, 145-8 and takes the form of a dialog between two laymen, one of whom is an indignant Iowan, who has refused to read the articles, but who discusses the differences in the various areas of controversy with a friend. The series was continued with reference to Schmidt, XVIII, 3, 17-20; 4, 25-31. The last installment charges Schmidt with falsification of the records he

In 1875 the Iowa Synod had not reached adjustment of the doctrinal controversy which had beset its course since the beginning, on the contrary, it was under heavy attack and internal dissension was about to provoke a serious crisis. Nevertheless its position had been clarified and was not to be affected by the upheaval which was under way. The original points of controversy on church and ministry had become subordinate, in fact in regard to the church the validity of its position was no longer questioned by Missouri, although that was not true of its views on the ministry. It had drawn attacks on itself by its incautious stand on chiliasm early in its history, but it had consistently maintained that it had never intended to take the position which had been attributed to it, it had modified extravagant earlier statements and that controversy too had abated as the number of adherents of chiliast views declined and their positions became more moderate. Only in regard to the doctrine of the anti-Christ was controversy still bitter. The Richtung of the synod by 1860 had become centered around its attitude toward the symbols. While modifications in this respect had been made in 1867 they did not affect the position materially. The basic point was recognition of open questions in doctrines not

---

used. An individual Iowa pastor of the Missouri faction made an indignant reply which he later repudiated in XVIII, 4, 31-2.

essential to faith and not unmistakably revealed in Scriptures and the contention that such doctrines should not be church-separating, a policy that was applied in its own midst where differing opinions on such points were freely tolerated. This position remained under heavy attack, but was being utterly misrepresented. The danger in 1875 was that such attack might break the synod up into factions, no longer willing to cooperate in mutual toleration within one body.

CHAPTER XVIII

FELLOWSHIP: RELATIONS WITH OTHER LUTHERANS 1854-1879

The Iowa Synod was originally organized to represent the *Neuendettelsau Richtung* in America. It has been noted how this purpose was modified somewhat during its first few years. The essence of the Neuendettelsau position was retained, namely the contention that faithfulness to the symbols, did not mean a rigorous conformity to their every letter, but that where complete agreement on every article of faith existed, differences on secondary points of doctrine should not be considered grounds for denial of church fellowship. When the synod found that consistent application on this basic principle could not be squared with an exclusive membership policy, which would have permitted the synod to set up synodical positions on secondary points and rigid conformity requirements, it adhered to the principle and freely tolerated divergent viewpoints on open questions in its own midst. Its *Richtung* thus came to center about open questions as non-church-separating. It emphasized unyielding confessional faithfulness in fundamentals, but combined with this position profession and practice of toleration in non-fundamental doctrinal controversy.

This position determined its attitude toward other American Lutheran Churches. It was consistently willing to establish church fellowship with bodies which it recognized as faithful to the confessions, regardless of whether full agreement existed on points which it held to be non-fundamental and, if circumstances warranted, it stood ready to cooperate with such bodies. Its attitude toward Missouri was fully consistent with this policy. Throughout the period Iowa sought definition of the differences, agreement on their non-fundamental character, and establishment of church fellowship on that basis, so that peace and amity might make it possible for the two synods to work alongside of each other and to discuss the differences with a view toward full agreement. It was Missouri which prevented achievement of this purpose.[1] The brief period of cooperation with Buffalo also illustrates the synodical policy. In this instance the two synods each recognized confessional faithfulness on the part of the other and for a time were willing to recognize differences as non-fundamental, with the result that they not only entered into church fellowship, but also into close cooperation in practical respects. It was Buffalo's recession from a readiness to regard differences as non-fundamental which ended this relationship.

During its first decade the synod was too small and too remote to develop extensive contacts with other Lutheran bodies. A closer approach to the small Indianapolis Synod was under consideration, but that body later merged with the Ohio Synod.[2] During the fifties and sixties neighboring synods came into existence as new organizations, or as a result of separations, in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois and also in Michigan which adopted the names of these states. After 1864 attempts were made to establish closer relationships with all of them. Doctrinal discussions were held, delegates were exchanged at synodical conventions and in several cases plans for cooperation in the maintenance of educational institutions were taken under consideration. In the end, however, these neighboring synods turned toward Missouri and became members of the Synodical Conference.

---

[1] The violent attacks at the end of the period would seem to indicate that Missouri was basically motivated by suspicion and distrust. Its leaders had become imbued with a personal antagonism against those of Iowa, which militated against any possibility of reaching an understanding. The presentation ignores the looming predestination controversy. When this issue had matured the Iowa leaders could no longer follow their former policy, because they held that Missouri was no longer faithful to the confessions, but had on this point substituted Calvinist doctrine for Lutheran conviction.

---

[2] The third convention in 1856, which recognized full church fellowship with Buffalo, gave some attention to an approach toward other Lutheran synods, but concluded that too little was known about them. A future convention might consider the possibilities. Since Iowa had agreed to accept Buffalo's plan for a church court, contacts with other bodies might have resulted, which consideration may have led to these plans, which were noted, Chronik, 16. Protokollbuch, Minutes Min. Conf., Wartburg, November 2-4, 1857, refers to a letter from a pastor of the Indianapolis Synod, who asked for synodical documents, so that his body might become acquainted with the position of the synod, with a view toward merging and indicated that his synod was also willing to participate in Buffalo's court plan. Since the Indianapolis Synod was reputed as confessionally Lutheran the conference agreed to send various documents and to ask for those of Indianapolis. Nothing further on this point was found. The merger with Ohio is noted, Neve, Geschichte, 292. A pastor was reported as joining the Iowa Synod from the Indianapolis Synod in 1868, K. B. XI, 21 161, but by then this body had become a district of the Ohio Synod, Peter and Schmidt, Geschichte der Allgemeinen Evang. Luth. Synode von Ohio und anderen Staaten, (Columbus, 1900), 153.

The Wisconsin Synod was several years older than Iowa and in its first years took no strong confessional position, because it contained Evangelical elements and drew support from such circles in Germany. In the mid-sixties, however, Wisconsin began to break these connections and to take a confessional stand, a change which was consummated by 1868.[3] Two members of the synod attended the Iowa pastoral conference at Macgregor in 1866 which discussed theses on church unity and open questions and suggested cooperation in the educational field.[4] In 1867 Grossmann and the two Fritschels attended the convention of the Wisconsin Synod and S. Fritschel presented the opinion of the Dorpat faculty. On its basis open questions and chiliasm were discussed, but Wisconsin members were divided as to whether the open question theory was acceptable and whether chiliasm could be considered an open question. When the visitors had to leave, the discussion was postponed to the next year.[5] Not long thereafter and shortly before the Missouri-Iowa colloquy in 1867, Wisconsin held a doctrinal discussion with Missouri, which resulted in full agreement.[6] In 1868 Wisconsin and Iowa took a common stand on the question of church practice in the General Council[7] and the presidential report to the Iowa convention of that year rejoiced over a brotherly relationship.[8] But by 1869 the relationship had become strained.[9] Wisconsin now stood on the side of Missouri and church fellowship was never consummated.

---

[3] K. B. XI, 10, 78-9, brought a notice describing the turn toward confessionalism in Wisconsin. In 13, 101-2, it was reported that Wisconsin had broken with the Union, only two pastors withdrawing. No further hindrance to church fellowship existed and Wisconsin stood shoulder to shoulder with Iowa on church practice in the General Council. This point will be discussed later.

[4] Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 126, mentions the educational project. Wisconsin apparently sought support for its institution at Watertown, and may have suggested college training for Iowa preparatory students there.

[5] Lutheraner XXIV, 11, 82-3. Wisconsin sent no delegates to the Iowa convention of 1867, which may have been because it was held at Toledo. That convention, however, heard a com-

---

mittee report on unionism in Wisconsin and instructed its delegates to the General Council to protest against admission of that synod on this ground, Zusammenstellung 1867, in I. S. D. It was not until the next year that Wisconsin broke with unionism. Perhaps it was for this reason that Wisconsin approached Missouri, although it seems more likely that the inconclusive result of the discussion with Iowa led to that step. The friendly tone of the Iowa reports on the Wisconsin convention of 1868 already cited, makes it seem unlikely, however, that action repudiating Iowa's position was then taken.

[6] Neve, Geschichte, 270.

[7] K. B. XI, 3, 21. Iowa introduced several resolutions to be noted subsequently and the account stresses Wisconsin's full support. Wisconsin, however, withdrew from the Council, because it postponed action, while Iowa did not join, but continued to attend.

[8] K. B. XI, 21, 163. Grossmann noted that the Wisconsin synodical report for 1868 welcomed Iowa visitors, announced a brotherly relationship and expressed hopes that it would continue and improve. There is no mention of an exchange of delegates, however.

[9] K. B. XII, 18, 143. Grossmann said that he could not make a report on relations with Wisconsin, because what he might say today, might no longer be true tomorrow. It was his last reference to attempts to maintain friendly relations with Wisconsin.

The Illinois Synod came into existence in 1867, when it seceded from an earlier body of that name. The confessional element was reorganized under the old name and withdrew from the General Synod, while the non-confessional element, organized as the Synod of Central Illinois, retained membership. The new body had invited Iowa to attend its organization meeting and two visitors established friendly relationships with the result that several students were sent to Wartburg.[10] In 1868, as already noted, this synod suggested location of the college in its congregation at Beardstown and the prospect of support from its membership was a factor in the separation of that institution from the seminary, Iowa proposing joint control.[11] Several members of the Illinois Synod were admitted into the synod. In 1869 the president reported that a delegate had attended the convention of the Illinois Synod, who had submitted the college proposals, and that a delegate from Illinois was expected to attend the convention to conduct further negotiations. He called attention, however, to a colloquy between Missouri and Illinois in 1869 which was reported to have settled all issues, including the relationship of Illinois to Iowa, to Missouri's satisfaction.[12] This proved to be true, with the result that Illinois withdrew from all cooperation with Iowa and eventually was merged into the Missouri Synod.[13]

---

[10] _K_. _B_. XI, 21, 163.

[11] _Ibid_., 23, 177-8.

[12] _Ibid_. XII, 18, 142. Pastors Stieger and C. A. Rueter came from the Illinois Synod, but neither remained in Iowa long.

The Minnesota Synod originated from missionary endeavors of the General Synod in the northwest in the late fifties and was formed in 1860. It held membership in the General Synod, but left it for confessional reasons in 1866 and became a member of the General Council. Grossmann reported to the convention of 1868 that two Iowa members had taken part in a pastoral conference in Minnesota recently and had become convinced that the synod was faithful to the confessions and pure in practice and had established friendly relations.[14] The next year he reported a cordial relationship and an exchange of delegates to the respective conventions.[15] Very shortly afterward, however, Minnesota held a colloquy with Wisconsin, which led to a close relationship between these synods and in later years to a merger. In 1871 Missouri met with representatives of several other synods to lay plans for a larger structure and in 1872 the Synodical Conference was formed, of which among others Wisconsin, Illinois and Minnesota became members and which was dominated by Missouri. Church fellowship between Iowa and any of these neighboring synods was thereafter out of the question.

---

[13] A letter, C. A. Rueter - Prof. ?, Bethel, Illinois, October 9, 1868, in I. S. D., suggests that Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Minnesota should draw together. The writer had lost faith in the General Council and advocated a strong confessional stand and sound practice. He wished the addressee to take the lead and approach Wisconsin in particular. The letter seems to indicate that a small synod felt insecure and wished to join a larger group. It seems probable that after Wisconsin made common cause with Missouri and this plan had failed, Illinois turned to Missouri likewise, if this writer reflected general sentiment.

[14] K. B. XI, 21, 163. One of the delegates was S. Fritschel.

[15] K. B. XII, 18, 143. A Minnesota delegate was in attendance, p. 141.

The Michigan Synod mentioned in the opening chapters had disbanded after Loehe's emissaries had left it for confessional reasons and joined in the organization of Missouri. In 1860 a second synod under that name was founded on a sound confessional basis, which became a member of the General Council. Laxity in practice originally made it objectionable to Iowa.[16] In 1869, however, through Iowa's initiative a free conference of confessional Lutherans was held at Ann Arbor, to which both Michigan and the Canada Synod were particularly invited. Agreement was reached on principles of communion discipline, and church fellowship established between Iowa and Michigan. Here also plans for establishment of a teachers' seminary with joint support, already noted, were discussed.[17] Nothing came of this project, but Michigan circles gave support to the orphanage at Toledo for the rest of the period. Further conferences were envisaged, but they soon ceased to be held. Friendly relationships, however, seem to have continued and it was not until the last decade of the century that Michigan too joined the Synodical Conference.[18]

---

[16] A letter, Kroenke - Grossmann, Riga, November 4, 1867, in I. S. D., protests against practice in the Michigan Synod and holds that it made church fellowship impossible. Deindoerfer's letters of this period frequently complain of the lax practice of Pastor Markscheffel in Toledo, who was a member of Michigan.

[17] K. B. XII, 14, 105-8; 15, 115-17, reports this free conference. Only one pastor of the Canada Synod attended, ten from Iowa and fourteen from Michigan, one member of the Ohio Synod was also present. Markscheffel disagreed, but was

No similar approach to the Ohio Synod is on record for this period. Individual pastors of that synod seem to have attended the free conferences occasionally. Much generous support was given to the orphanage at Toledo from Ohio circles. Several Ohio pastors attended the convention of 1867 at Toledo as guests and the synod there appointed a delegate to the Ohio convention, but there is no record of a reciprocal gesture.[19]

---

repudiated and left the Michigan Synod. It was decided to meet again the next year. The seminary matter was referred to the synods. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Toledo, May 28, 1869, also discusses the conference and its results. It does not specifically refer to church fellowship, but characterizes the Michigan pastors as Christians of good will, though weak. Grossmann's presidential report of 1869 mentions the conference with mild approval, K. B. XII, 18, 142.

[18] Chronik, 90, mentions the conference of 1869 and a decision to hold conferences annually, but notes that they soon ceased for lack of attendance. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, May 15, 1872, in I. S. D., mentions that invitations for a conference had been sent to the Michigan and the Canada Synods, but only to avoid giving the impression that Iowa wished to drop them. Nothing would come of it, the movement lacked the right kind of leadership. The letter makes it appear that a Michigan pastor was chairman and does not imply lack of interest, but mentions lack of leadership. There seems to have existed an inclination to treat the Canada Synod on the same basis as Michigan, but there is little information on this point. Canada pastors were occasionally accepted into Iowa membership and placed in Iowa congregations. K. B. XIII, 18, 142 indicates that a conference was held in 1870.

[19] Zusammenstellung 1867 in I. S. D. reports that delegates were appointed for the conventions of the Pennsylvania

In parish affairs contacts between the two synods existed, which seem usually to have been friendly, though as the Strauss affair, discussod in an earlier chapter, indicates they sometimes led to complications. In that instance at least Iowa was anxious to avoid giving offense.[20] In the late sixties both synods were interested in the General Council and Ohio took a stand on practice in which Iowa concurred in most respects,[21] but Ohio never entered the Council and soon entered the Synodical Conference, in which it was to remain for the rest of the period, and with this action church fellowship was precluded.

There are few indications of close contacts with the Augustana Synod, although both synods were active in Illinois, undoubtedly because each body worked with its own national group. Augustana became a member of the General Council, however, and gave approval to Iowa's position on practice, with the result that the two synods recognized church fellow-

---

Synod, which had sent a delegate to Toledo, the Missouri Synod which was there approached to arrange the colloquy, and the Ohio Synod.

[20] The motive seems not to have been the preservation of friendship as much as a strong desire to avoid unpleasantness. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Toledo, February 28, 1868, in this connection refers to Ohio as arbitrary (gewalttaetig).

[21] K. B. XII, 1, 5-6. It may be added that a letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, July 5, 1871, in I. S. D., mentions that some pastors of the Ohio Synod were dissatisfied with Ohio's approach to Missouri and wished to draw closer to Iowa. Deindoerfer suggested a cautious awaiting of developments. He did not again mention the matter.

ship as existing between them.[22] A Danish Lutheran Church in America was only in process of formation during this period. The only recorded contact was a joint service on the occasion of the dedication of a Danish church in Cedar Falls, Iowa, in which the local Iowa pastor and his congregation took part.[23] The Norwegian Lutheran Synod was active in Iowa and Wisconsin, but it made common cause with Missouri throughout the period and became connected with the Synodical Conference from its inception. In 1871 the Texas Synod, also in the General Council, requested Iowa to supply it with pastors. In reply the synod noted that the confessional stand of the Texas Synod was correct, but because of mixed membership it was weak in practice. The synod would be willing to send mature men, when it could, but not candidates.[24] It was not until considerably later that men could be spared, so that this contact seems to have had no immediate results, although in the next period the two synods were to consummate a merger. A somewhat similar request from the Bruderbund in 1873 and the establishment of close relationships with this Buffalo splinter in 1873 have been noted in an earlier chapter.

---

[22] K. B. XII, 3, 23-4, reports agreement on altar fellowship and 8, 62-3, on secret societies. In 9, 65, an Augustana statement on altar fellowship was reprinted.

[23] K. B. XVI, 19, 150, reports this incident in 1873. Foelsch of the Iowa Synod preached in German, the pastor loci in Danish, the congregations sang the hymns in both languages.

[24] Chronik, 99.

The synods composing the General Synod were regarded as unsound in confessional position and lax in practice and the question of church fellowship did not arise in regard to them. Of several such synods with fields in the territory in which Iowa worked, the English Iowa Synod may be mentioned, which was organized in 1857. This body had a German conference with several pastors and congregations in eastern Iowa.[25] It took a sound confessional position and in 1867 proposed withdrawal from the General Synod to the English Iowa Synod, at a time when conservative Lutheran bodies were taking that step in various areas. When the synod refused, these pastors withdrew and after a colloquy were accepted into the Iowa Synod with their congregations.[26] Beyond this accession there are few indications of contacts with the General Synod.[27]

---

[25] Organization of the English Iowa Synod was reported in Luth. Zeitschrift, I, 10, on the last page. Organization of the German Conference with nine members, one of whom was Oswald, who previously had sought membership in Iowa in IX, 10, 76. It was reported to have adopted the position of the Wisconsin Synod.

[26] Luth. Zeitschrift, X, 40, 317. Seven pastors were said to have left and to have joined Iowa with their congregations. The president's report in 1868 gave five pastors as received through colloquy from the English Iowa Synod, Strobel, Kiesel, Brecht, Pfister, Schumacher, K. B. XI, 21, 161. Oswald had died by that time. Luth. Kalender 1867 lists pastors, previously mentioned in Luth. Zeitschrift, as belonging to this group as follows: Kiesel, Nauvoo, Illinois; Ritter, Davenport; Kern, Franklin Center; Pfister, Farmington; Brecht, Monticello; Strobel, Fort Madison; Bangerter, Wilton; A. Lutz, Lyons. Obviously one of the eight listed did not join, perhaps Bangerter, because Strobel appears to have brought Wilton into the Synod. Kern though not listed by Grossmann was a member for a time, President's report, 1867, in I. S. D. If Lutz ever belonged, it could have been for a very short period only and the synod did not serve Lyons. Only Strobel, Pfister, and Ritter remained members for a period of years, so Ritter though not listed by Grossmann, probably went to Nebraska at

The Iowa Synod was invited to participate in a convention at Reading, Pennsylvania, in 1866, which the Pennsylvania Synod called in order to unite the confessional Lutheran Synods of America in the General Council. Grossmann and G. Fritschel went to Reading, not without misgivings, and inclined to think that a series of free conferences were preferable as a preliminary measure to establish doctrinal

---

once, where he was to stay for a period of years, and became a member a little later. Schumacher served a congregation at Caloma, Iowa, which he may have taken too late for listing in 1867, or his listing in this connection may be an error, he may have come from another source. It may be added that there was much trouble with unionism in most of the congregations and several of them were also lost sooner or later.

[27] A case where a pastor newly arrived from Germany innocently practiced church fellowship, contrary to synodical practice, with a pastor of the General Synod was reported critically, Lutheraner XXX, 5, 39. K. B. XVII, 7, 55 presented the facts and asked for an apology, which was refused, Lutheraner XXX, 8, 61. Missouri had long maintained that Iowa was, if anything, rather worse than the General Synod, because it occupied the same position without acknowledging it, XXIII, 12, 94-5. A letter, Hay - S. Fritschel, Gettysburg, July 1, 1876, notified the recipient that Pennsylvania College, (General Synod) had bestowed a D. D. degree upon him. Another letter, H. E. Jacobs - S. Fritschel, Gettysburg, June 28, 1876, indicated that the writer had suggested this honor and invited acceptance, despite disagreement with the General Synod, on the ground that the initiative had come from the General Council elements at Gettysburg. A note on the letter indicates that the honor was declined on the ground that the recipient must reserve his freedom to contend against the position of the institution. Both Fritschels accepted D. D. degrees from Muehlenberg College a little later, conferred by that General Council institution according to a letter, Board of Trustees, Muehlenberg College - S. Fritschel, G. Fritschel, Allentown, June 27, 1879. All letters in I. S. D.

unity.[28] The convention adopted a set of theses on doctrinal unity, which Iowa found acceptable. Missouri, also represented, suggested free conferences in place of a definite organization. This was rejected and a set of constitutional theses adopted, but Missouri was offered a right to attend, using the convention as a free conference. A committee was appointed to draft a constitution for submission to the participating synods, who were to decide whether or not they would seek membership.[29] When the delegates returned with reports of so favorable a tenor, considerable enthusiasm for the General Council manifested itself in the Iowa Synod, though voices were not lacking which pointed out that practice in the eastern synods was not always in harmony with the principles professed at Reading.[30]

---

[28] *K. B.* X, 1, 2-3. S. Fritschel was in Europe.

[29] *K. B.* X, 2, 5-6, brings the theses on doctrinal unity and a statement on Iowa's position as submitted is given, pp. 4-5. The constitutional theses are printed, 2, 10-12. The offer to Missouri, 1, 7, was significant for though Missouri rejected it, Iowa later made use of it. Statements by the Missouri delegates outlining their position and by a number of other delegates which agreed substantially with Iowa's point of view are given, 2, 12-15. Sixteen synods were represented, not all of whom subsequently joined. Walther and Sihler designated as Missouri delegates were not present, though two other pastors appeared instead. Both German and English were used freely. Deindoerfer, *Geschichte*, 150, indicates that strong sentiment for membership prevailed in the Synod. *Luth. Zeitschrift* X, 3, 21, reports that Iowa and Pennsylvania men met for the first time at Reading and that the impression made had been excellent. Cordial personal relationships were to develop in the future and the Pennsylvania Synod sent Brobst, the editor, to Toledo as delegate to the Iowa convention the next year.

References have already been made to the preoccupation of the convention of 1867 with ecclesiastical unity. The president's report called on the synod to take part in the current attempts to unite confessional Lutherans. In addition to the paper on church unity noted previously, a set of theses on membership in the General Council was submitted. It emphasized the necessity of unity in faith and confession, but agreed that, if it existed, an external union was useful. However, confessional unity must be reflected in a corresponding practice and only on that basis could a union be founded. The position of any synod must be judged by its official declarations, and while no synod should be held responsible for any one incident, all members of a union should be bound by the common principles and expected to maintain a corresponding practice. Church fellowship, with synods whose position and practice was satisfactory in principle, would not necessarily extend to individual members whose practice varied. Sound practice was particularly necessary in regard to altar fellowship, and membership in secret societies, and the synod itself must guard its own practice in these respects. Iowa would be ready to become a member of the General Council with the understanding that the other member synods were in agreement with these stipulations.[31]

---

[30] An article in K. B. X, 6, 44-5, admitted that unlutheran practice did exist, but argued that sound principles entitled a synod to be recognized as Lutheran. It was defensible if weaknesses were borne and synods could not be held responsible, for every incident that occurred within them. It may be noted here that Missouri objected to Iowa admission into the Council, because it did not regard Iowa as confessionally Lutheran, Lutheraner, XXIII, 10, 77-8. This was probably the cause for Grossmann's remark cited chapter XVII, footnote 32, which no doubt led to Iowa's request for the colloquy of 1867. References to this attitude attracted sufficient attention in Germany to occasion printing of comments on it, Freimund, 1867, 32, Beilage 288; 33, Beilage, 297-303.

The constitution of the General Council was also discussed on basis of a draft which had been prepared and submitted. A committee noted a number of objections and the delegates were instructed to suggest modifications at the Council convention. The theses were adopted and a concluding section which declared that synod would have to withdraw, if action contrary to the confessions were ever taken, and then resolved to join the General Council, was unanimously carried.[32] The convention chose Grossmann, and S. and G. Fritschel as delegates, who thus were authorized to enroll the synod as a member of the General Council, but only on condition that the Council make a satisfactory declaration in regard to practices concerning unionism, particularly in respect to altar and pulpit fellowship.

---

[31] The president's report or address for 1867 is in I. S. D. The theses, which were read by G. Fritschel are in Chronik, 82-3, a number of them are printed in Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 150-1, and all, K. B. XI, 6, 43-4; 7, 513, with comments. There were fifteen, of which fourteen have been summarized, the last contained the resolution to join. It may be noted that the synod asked for exclusion of members of secret societies, but did not make this request a sine-qua non. It is probable that the request referred to pastors who were members.

[32] Chronik, 83, reports the constitutional objections and the unanimous passage of thesis 15. This action is also in

At the Fort Wayne session of the General Council in 1867 the question of practice in which the Iowa delegates had this special interest was brought up through a written request of the Ohio Synod, which had delegates present, but had not taken membership. Ohio inquired what the position of the Council would be toward mixed communion, pulpit fellowship with sectarians, secret societies and chiliasm.[33] The four points, as they came to be known, were referred to a committee. The committee drafted a rather evasive reply referring to proper constitutional procedure, on the ground that the Council could not answer inquiries from the outside. This aroused protest, it being held that the Ohio Synod was justified in making inquiries on which its entrance would depend. G. Fritschel, who was a member of the committee, reported that Iowa would raise similar questions and thereupon a clause was added, referring Ohio to the reply that would be made to Iowa.[34]

After the report had been adopted, the Iowa delegates reported that since agreement of principle and practice was requisite to unity, they had been instructed to request that the Council recognize certain essentials of practice in its constitution. Primarily they asked agreement that a sound

---

Zusammenstellung 1867 in I. S. D., which mentions a committee to draft instructions on the constitution for the delegates. *K. B.* X, 8, 62, also reports these actions.

[33] *General Council*, *First Convention*, 12, 13.

[34] The committee report is *Ibid.*, 16-17. The procedure is discussed, *K. B.* XI, 3, 19.

confessional position must lead to rejection of church fellowship with non-Lutherans, of service by Lutheran pastors in mixed congregations, of admission of such congregations and their pastors into Lutheran synods, of admission of non-Lutherans to Lutheran altars and of non-Lutheran clergyman to Lutheran pulpits. As secondary points they mentioned church discipline, particularly in respect to communion and secret societies, and recognition of the principle that synodical and Council resolutions could have only advisory, not legislative, force in congregations. These proposals were immediately referred to another committee, composed of a member of each member synod.[35]

This committee drafted a resolution referring the matter to the constituent synods for discussion and thus postponed a decision.[36] The Iowa delegates thereupon submitted a statement which pointed out that the resolution of their synod to join the Council was contingent upon acceptance of its position in regard to practice. The synod in voting for membership had believed that the Reading declaration warranted its assumption that the code of practices suggested would be adopted. The delegates must therefore regretfully abstain from voting privileges, but they would withdraw to a position sanctioned in the constitution under which the Council might grant the privilege of debate to synods which had adopted the fundamental principles, but had not ratified the constitution. They hoped that they need not long remain in this position, but that the Council would soon remove the obstacle to full membership.[37]

---

[35] General Council, First Convention, 17-18. The proposals are also printed, Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 152. K. B. XI, 3, 19, emphasizes the secondary character of the suggestions so characterized and reports that they were not discussed at all at Fort Wayne. In 2, 10-11, this report discussed unionist practices in the Council and pointed out that the Iowa statement at Reading had contained these points. It had not been discussed, but the delegates had not noticed unfavorable reactions and they do not seem to have anticipated difficulties at Fort Wayne.

[36] K. B. XI, 3, 20, reported this action with the statement that a decision was postponed to the next session. The Iowa delegates, of whom S. Fritschel was a member of the committee, did not protest the delay, because they believed that time was required to clarify the position of other synods. General Council, First Convention, 19, brings the committee report and indicates that five members, including all three Wisconsin delegates, had their negative votes entered on the minutes. The resolution itself indicates postponement without

It seems clear that the synod had underestimated the degree to which the practices to which it objected were carried on in eastern synods despite sound positions in principle, and the strength of their adherents. The delegates seem originally to have been confident that the delay would not be long, but they soon became aware of currents which ran

---

mention of the next session, and could be interpreted as an outright rejection. This apparently was not the intention, however, for the matter did come up in 1868.

[37] Ibid., 33-4. This statement asserted that the Council had not rejected the proposals and stated that many members and even entire delegations accepted them. Immediately following is a resolution in which the Council accepted Iowa's proposed status. K. B. XI, 3, 20-21, reports this Iowa statement. It may be noted that the entire report on the Fort Wayne session runs through 1, 5-6; 2, 10-11; 3, 18-21. Chronik, 86, summarizes these events and gives the practice proposals.

strongly against Iowa's position.[38] At the Iowa convention of 1868 they submitted a report which pointed out the historic roots of eastern unionism, took note that no decision either way had been reached, and admitted that a sharp struggle was in prospect. Postponement of the issue had been advisable under the circumstances, but a decision in 1868 was in prospect and it was encouraging that most western synods had taken their stand with Iowa. They did not suggest that Iowa should yield, on the contrary its membership in the Council must depend on acknowledgement of the right principles. While awaiting the decision, the synod should continue negotiations within the Council, participate in general free conferences, if held, and enter into closer relations with synods which agreed with its own position.[39] The convention approved the action of the delegates at Fort Wayne and while selecting delegates to the 1868 convention instructed them not to consummate membership, but to declare that the decision of the Council must be reported back to the next Iowa convention.[40]

---

[38] A preface to a new volume mentioned formation of the Council as one of the outstanding developments of 1867 and expressed hopes that Iowa would be able to join at a later time, K. B. XI, 1, 2. But in the subsequent report on the Fort Wayne session notice was taken of strong opposition in the eastern church press and Council acceptance was considered doubtful, 3, 20.

[39] K. B. XI, 22, 170-3. The report mentioned the Wisconsin, Illinois and Minnesota Synods as having adopted its stand and Michigan and Augustana as likely to do so. The delegates do not seem to have sensed the trend toward Missouri in most of these cases, which was destined to destroy hopes for closer relationships. Even if this had not occurred the small memberships of these western synods did not give them great strength in the Council. The position of the Pennsylvania Synod was presented as doubtful. The synod voted to attend free conferences, if held, from which resolution those in Michigan may have stemmed. It did not select delegates to conventions of other synods, but gave the president authority to appoint them, in terms which indicated doubts about continued friendship with neighboring synods.

The General Council met at Pittsburgh in 1868 and adopted resolutions on all of the four points raised by the inquiry from Ohio during the preceding session and thus also gave an answer to Iowa's proposals. Opinion in Iowa was divided in regard to this answer. S. Fritschel wrote a long report in which he indicated that the resolutions on secret societies and chiliasm were satisfactory, though criticism in detail might be made.[41] On altar and pulpit fellowship the position taken was not satisfactory. The resolutions on admission to communion opposed indiscriminate admission and specifically barred heretics and those who erred on essential points of doctrine, but they did not exclude non-Lutherans completely. While exceptional cases might occur, the rule should not provide for them.[42] In regard to pulpit fellowship the Council avoided a straightforward exclusion of non-Lutherans from Lutheran pulpits. Its resolutions pointed in that direction, but the discussion made it clear that there were members whose tendency was unionist and who would give the rule a much milder interpretation.[43] The report did not recommend immediate membership, but it said and implied that the Council was moving in the right direction, that the resolutions were acceptable so far as they went and that the synod ought to continue to participate on a limited basis with a view toward eventual full membership. S. Fritschel again reported in this sense to the convention of 1869. Prof. F. Lutz, however, presented another report which sharply criticized the Council in respect to altar and pulpit fellowship and Klindworth seconded this position strongly. The convention reached no final decision, but it again appointed delegates to the 1869 convention of the Council and thus continued the relationship.[44]

---

[40] Ibid., 172; Zusammenstellung 1868 in I. S. D., Chronik, 88. The last source indicates that some opposition to membership was arising on the ground that the Council contemplated state boundaries for its constituent synods, which would divide the Iowa Synod and that the constitution gave the Council legislative powers. While there was constitutional basis for such criticism, the Council later took measures safeguarding far-flung bodies like Augustana and Iowa. S. Fritschel and Deindoerfer were chosen delegates, G. Fritschel was to attend eventual free conferences.

[41] The report runs through K. B. XII, 1-5. The resolutions on secret societies are in 4, 25-29, on chiliasm, 5, 33-7.

---

[42] Altar fellowship is discussed Ibid., 1, 1-3, 2, 9-13. It was pointed out that taking communion involved an act of confession and that to admit members of other confessions would weaken the sense of confessional loyalty.

[43] Pulpit fellowship is discussed Ibid., 3, 17-20. The opinion was expressed that the resolutions were acceptable, but attitudes of Council members were described which were objectionable.

[44] Chronik, 91. S. and G. Fritschel and Klindworth were chosen delegates thus representing both viewpoints. The writer has not seen a copy of the Lutz report. It may have been influenced by Missouri criticism of S. Fritschel's K. B. report, Lutheraner XXV, 12, 85-7; 13, 94-5; 14, 108-9; 15, 119; 19, 149, which held that Iowa wished to join, but that Ohio's inconvenient questions had raised a stumbling block, which S. Fritschel was trying to side-step. The Council resolutions were found unsatisfactory and unionist at every point.

The General Council in 1869 received an inquiry from the Minnesota Synod, whether the Iowa appraisal of its 1868 resolutions was accurate. It postponed a reply to the next session, which was held in Lancaster, Ohio, in 1870.[45] No delegate from Iowa attended this session[46] in consequence of which a misunderstanding developed.[47] The Council gave a reply to the Minnesota inquiry of the year before which the Iowa Synod did not deem satisfactory,[48] but the president was reported in the church papers to have made an oral statement that the rule should be, Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants, Lutheran pulpits for Lutheran pastors, which was what the Iowa delegates had been advocating. At the Iowa convention of 1871 Klindworth advocated complete withdrawal, but the theological professors called attention to President Krauth's reported statement and opposed this measure.[49] The convention resolved to request the Council to adopt the oral statement of the president as its own declaration and chose a delegate to attend the next convention and to submit this request.[50]

---

[45] A report on the convention of 1869 at Chicago is in K. B. 24, 190-2. Since a statement was made that indicated a stricter policy on admissions to communion, this report struck a hopeful note and indicated that the Council was moving in the right direction. In XIII, 2, 12-15, an article from an eastern writer pointed out that language and historic development differentiated the eastern synods from those of the west, but indicated a belief that a genuine desire for cooperation existed and that some progress was being made.

[46] Chronik, 98, says the reason was the distance of the convention city. The president's report in 1871 stated that S. Fritschel had been appointed delegate, but had returned from Europe too late to attend the meeting, K. B. XIV, 13, 99. He had stopped to visit eastern leaders to consult with them on the questions under discussion on his way to Germany, K. B. XIII, 15, 115-16.

[47] Missouri commented on the Lancaster resolutions, Lutheraner, XXVII, 7, 51-2. While the rule as stated by the president was deemed acceptable, exceptions were left to individual judgment.

[48] Chronik, 99.

S. Fritschel attended the Council convention of 1871 at Rochester and presented the request, but no action was taken until the following year at Akron, where S. Fritschel was again present. When the full Krauth statement was taken under consideration it developed that the president had indeed proclaimed the rule as reported, but that he had specifically referred to exceptions which might be granted by favor. The Council complied with the Iowa request and officially adopted the Akron rule which provided that only Lutheran pastors should be admitted to Lutheran pulpits and only Lutheran communicants to Lutheran altars. Exceptions could be granted not as a matter of right, but as favors, pastors proceeding conscientiously according to Council principles in such exceptional cases.[51] The synod was thus in the embarassing position that its request had been met, but that its objection still stood. S. Fritschel made no protest and received censure for his failure to do so from members of the synod who had come to be opposed to the Council.[52] When the Iowa Synod met in convention at Davenport in 1873 considerable sentiment for terminating the connection with the Council seems to have existed. S. Fritschel opposed such a step, however, indicating that the synod had a duty to help toward strengthening the confessional element in the Council. In the end the convention decided, that because of the misunderstanding about the statement of 1870 the position of the Council could not yet be deemed satisfactory, but that the existing relationship should be continued and efforts renewed to obtain full recognition of unmixed altar fellowship.[53]

---

[49] Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 47-8. Grossmann's report to the convention had mentioned that it would have to consider the future attitude of the synod toward the Council, but that he saw no reason for a change, K. B. XVI, 13, 99.

[50] Chronik, 98-9, K. B. XIV, 21, 161. The Lancaster resolutions were deemed a set of instructions for pastors for exceptional cases, rather than a statement of principle. The synod rejoiced over the statement of President Krauth and considered it a clear and unequivocal statement of confessional principle, but could not consider it as an official statement of the Council and therefore asked the latter to make it that.

---

[51] K. B. XVI, 1, 2-4; Chronik, 102. The oral statement had not appeared in the minutes and no Iowa delegate had been present in 1870 to hear it. The proponents had undoubtedly been unwise in presenting a statement to the Iowa convention with which they were not fully familiar, and in taking the resolution to the Council without checking. S. Fritschel admitted in a letter cited in Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 49-50, that he first heard the full statement, when the matter was under discussion at Akron in 1872. He had acted on basis of lettersand reports which had misled him.

[52] S. Fritschel reported on the Akron convention in K. B. XVI, 2, 12-13; 3, 20-22; 4, 25-26. Much of the report dealt with the work of the Council and indicated that favorable terms would be granted to Iowa in regard to the hymnal on which work was proceeding. In No. 3 he reported the rule and noted that the demand of 1871 had been met. He indicated that he had intended in 1871 to advocate a rule without exceptions, but noted that the exceptions were to affect application of the principle, rather than the principle itself, though he admitted that the final statement weakened this interpretation. The report indicated that he was not wholly dissatisfied and felt that progress had been made. Synod would have to decide whether it felt that its conditions had been met. Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 19-20, censures Fritschel's silence at Akron and indicates that some members of the synod were indignant and suspected trickery. The letter, Oestliche Pastoral Conferenz - Praesidium, May 3, 1873, in I. S. D., asked the convention of 1873 to consider its attitude. It held that the Council had removed the obstacle to Iowa membership by acceding to its request with the Akron rule. If because of the faulty form of the request its action was still unsatisfactory, no new interpretation should be asked, but only satisfactory application. Individual malpractice in the Council should be met with patient efforts toward rectification. The conference felt, however, that the issue of joining should not be decided by a mere majority, if part of the membership lacked confidence in the Council. In this case membership

The synod was represented at the 1873 convention of the General Council at Erie, Pennsylvania, when the position of

---

should be delayed and lack of confidence on the part of a portion of the membership should frankly be given as the reason.

[53] Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 52, gives a descrip- of Davenport procedure. Klindworth's pamphlet discusses the General Council question, pp. 25-8, and 47-55, from the point of view of an opponent and tries to prove that the theological professors were the only real advocates and that their motives were selfish and their methods deceptive. An account from the opposite point of view, rejecting this interpretation and disproving certain allegations is in Bericht...Untersuchung, 11-12 and 36-41. Klindworth made no reply on this point in his next pamphlet. He himself seems to have been an opponent since 1869. A criticism of the Akron rule by him appeared Theologische Monatshefte, VI, 2, 33-7. A fragment of a letter, Brobst - S. Fritschel, Allentown, July 18, 1872, in I. S. D., also refers to his objections. The action of the Davenport convention is reported, Chronik, 113; K. B. XVI, 23, 177 and in Beschluesse 1873 in I. S. D., which indicates that the resolution to send a delegate again carried 26-10. The president's report in 1873 pointed out that the synod was completely isolated, but said that this was neither a special advantage nor a special misfortune, K. B. XVI, 17, 132.

practice received no further development, but when recognition of the General Synod through appointment of a delegate to its session was refused.[54] It was again represented the following year at Jamestown, New York, where no action touching the controversial point was taken.[55] S. Fritschel also continued to work with the hymnal committee through these years. At the disturbed Iowa convention in Madison in 1875 the faction, whose activities are yet to be noted, again threshed over the Akron rule and charged the Council with unionism and the synod also for continued association with it and urged a break. This demand was rejected, however, it was pointed out that the synod was not a member of the Council and in no way responsible for its shortcomings, but that its very presence without membership was a protest against them. The convention resolved to adhere to the resolution of 1873.[56]

---

[54] K. B. XVI, 22, 172-4. S. Fritschel was the delegate. The Council refused to send the delegate to the General Synod, because that would involve recognition of its position. The report regretted, however, that constituent synods of both bodies did exchange delegates.

[55] K. B. XVII, 22, 170-1. The delegate was not named, but was probably S. Fritschel. The report regretted that the hymnal was not ready, but stated that few people realized the extent of the work involved.

[56] Synodalbericht 1875, 24-6. A full explanation of the Lancaster confusion was given and the duty of working for recognition of sound practice was stressed. It may be noted that the Eastern District convention of 1874 had discussed altar fellowship and strongly endorsed the synodical position on that point, K. B. XVII, 14, 105.

Later in the year 1875 it appeared that the Council had finally taken the step which Iowa had advocated so earnestly and so long. Meeting at Galesburg, Illinois, it discussed recent Augustana Synod theses on strict altar and pulpit fellowship practices, expressed satisfaction over them and took the occasion to call attention to the rule, Lutheran pulpits only for Lutheran pastors, Lutheran altars only for Lutheran communicants. No mention was made of exceptions.[57] The synod rejoiced over this development and it is possible that it would have joined at once, if the convention of 1875 had not as usual preceded that of the Council.[58] As it was, four years elapsed before the next Iowa convention was held. In the meantime a bitter conflict arose in the Council over the Galesburg rule and it became quite clear that the English speaking element in it was opposed to the application of the rule. In subsequent Council conventions a long series of theses on the subject was submitted and their discussion proceeded very slowly.[59] By 1879 it had become clear that unionist practices had not ended in the Council and the prevailing sentiment in the synod seems to have been that as long as the Galesburg rule was controversial, the synod could not become a member. The convention of 1879 seems to have decided to continue the old relationship.[60] Ten years later the Council held that the Akron and the Galesburg rules were not in conflict and that both were in force.[61]

---

[57] K. B. XVIII, 22, 173-4 reported the adoption. S. Fritschel had been present as delegate. Chronik, 125, brought the rule.

[58] S. Fritschel's presidential report to the Western District in 1876 reported on the rule and noted that a conflict along German-English lines, bitter in tone had arisen, K. B. XIX, 13, 100. The district expressed its gratification, hoped that the defenders would stand firmly and rejoiced that the way to Lutheran unity had been opened, 14, 108. In 6, 43-4, an article stated that the conflict that had arisen was not to be regretted, for it would force opponents into the open and expose the danger of unionist practices, while staunch defenders stood for the right principle.

In spite of its early enthusiasm the Iowa Synod thus did not take membership in the General Council, although it maintained a relationship with it throughout the period. The failure of the Council to meet the standard set by the synod can hardly be laid to indifferentism. The eastern synods had originated in a period when confessional consciousness was weak and established practices reflected that origin. They contained many members whose practice was unobjectionable and who agreed with Iowa's standards in principle. Strict application, however, would have caused grave difficulties and disturbances and would probably have driven many members into the General Synod or out of the Lutheran church. The conservative members therefore believed in gradual procedure and consequently were concerned with exceptions. The delegates of the Iowa Synod, as they became acquainted with eastern conditions, saw the difficulty and therefore advocated patience. They seem to have been concerned over the integration of their synod into American Lutheranism and therefore wished to maintain a connection. Not improbably they were willing to join as full-fledged members, in the hope that the addition of more strongly confessional bodies would strengthen conservative eastern leaders and assist in the process of a gradually developing strictly Lutheran practice. When, however, the issue was raised clearly and directly through the four points in 1867, their synod had to take a stand. Attacked as inclined toward unionism itself by Missouri, that stand had to be maintained without compromise. Since the synod itself had made strict, originally excessively strict, practice one of its cardinal principles, members who were not familiar with eastern conditions, and who were acutely aware of the suspicions regarding themselves in neighboring synods, had a tendency to lose patience and to reject the Council altogether. The leaders were able to check this sentiment and to maintain a contact through attendance at conventions and participation in activities, but full membership had become impossible after the first few years. Even so, however, the synod was through its leaders able to promote the development of sound confessional tendencies in the Lutheran Church of America and its own isolation, hedged in as it was by the surrounding Synodical Conference, was broken down, with the result that it acquired a status as a champion of conservatism Lutheranism, which its opponents were particularly eager to deny to it.

---

[59] Discussion of the Council conventions of 1877 and 1879, the theses and the slow consideration are in Lehre und Wehre, XXIII, 11, 343-8; XXV, 11, 337-42.

[60] K. B. XXII, 22, 175-6, mentions that delegates had attended the Council convention at Zanesville, Ohio. The article lauded Krauth and his stand for the rule, but it expressed the sentiments given in the text. It referred to occupation of sectarian pulpits in Zanesville by delegates to the Council convention and though finding this less objectionable than the reverse practice, referred to it as unionism which must be fought. It is probable that the statement on membership in the text and a further one which indicates that it was the practice to send delegates reflect decisions of the convention of 1879, but in the absence of minutes or printed report this cannot be verified.

[61] Fritschel, Geschichte, 362.

CHAPTER XIX

CRISIS: THE UPHEAVAL OF 1875

In the mid-sixties the synod had passed through a period in which its position had been questioned from within. At a time when confessional loyalty was an issue throughout the Lutheran Church in America and when the confessional position of the synod was under strong attack from Missouri, when particularly chiliast doctrines, violently denounced, were losing their hold, misgivings and doubts had led to the second visit of S. Fritschel to Europe for the purpose of consultation with recognized theological authorities. The resulting modification of the theory of confessional interpretation and clarification of the confessional position of the synod, the approach to Missouri through the colloquy and the participation in the movement that led to the establishment of the General Council, had allayed misgivings and had for a time consolidated support of the synodical position.

These developments had, however, produced a strain in the relationship with Neuendettelsau which had not been allowed to come to a head, but which had hardly been completely removed. The relationship to the General Council had gradually become controversial and the fact that opponents charged Iowa with unionism because of it, had a tendency to reanimate in some quarters misgivings in regard to confessional soundness of its advocates. The relationship with Missouri had deteriorated rather than improved and from that quarter also the confessional position of the synod continued to be impugned. Attempts to draw nearer to small neighboring synods, after a promising beginning, had resulted in total failure and those bodies had made common cause with Missouri, so that particularly in the west the synod found itself in complete isolation and under a form of ostracism. The leaders of the synod, in part at least, accepted this isolation and sought compensation through development of the relationship with the General Council. To those members to whom this solution had become unacceptable it might well seem preferable to try once more to settle difficulties with Missouri and seek an approach to the Synodical Conference.

Since the synod was ready to tolerate differences on open questions in its own midst, it was quite possible that members might hold the Missouri viewpoints on the various controverted doctrines, as long as they did not demand that the doctrines themselves cease to be regarded as open questions. In the early seventies Pastor F. Matter presented the Missouri viewpoint on chiliasm, the anti-Christ and the ministry in several papers and discussions before the Southern Iowa Conference. He won approval from a number of its members and seems strongly to have influenced a number of younger pastors, recent graduates of the seminary, so that by 1873 a group of Missourian tendencies was beginning to make its influence felt.[1] Matter was not entirely unopposed in his conference.

---

[1] A series of historical articles on the Southern Iowa Conference in K. B. XXXIX, 15-21, gives information on this

Pastor W. Hertel, a young man, only a few years out of Neuendettelsau, defended the views of that school, but he was so strongly contradicted, that he felt he was merely receiving toleration as an erring brother and that he wrote to Neuendettelsau to this effect.[2] In particular Pastor W. T. Strobel, an able man from the English Iowa Synod group, came to share Matter's views. Interested particularly in ending controversy and working toward ecclesiastical unity, Strobel came to feel that Iowa was wrong on the open question theory, and to hold that the new form of the confessional paragraph adopted in 1873 had radically changed the confessional posi-

---

point. Matter presented a paper in 1872 which took the position that the pope was the anti-Christ and another which rejected all chiliasm outright. In 1874 he again presented theses on chiliasm. No paper on the ministry is mentioned, but the next footnote will indicate that this topic too was discussed. It is difficult to lay a finger on definite evidence, but one can sense discord at the Davenport convention of 1873. Undercurrents seem to have been running, which did not lead to open manifestations, but which foreshadowed the storm that was to break two years later. A reference to them appears in a letter, Kroenke - Deindoerfer, Riga, November 28, 1875, in Deindoerfer Papers, which reviews the controversy and expresses the opinion that particularly in the west the synod had admitted too many diverse elements. Kroenke says that he felt this at Davenport, particularly the Matter current.

[2] Hertel was noted as the only opponent to Matter's views in K. B. XXXIX, 17, 186, but this probably means only that he alone spoke out. Letters, Hertel - Grossmann, Highland Centre, August 7; September 28, 1874, in I. S. D., report that he had written to Bauer and indicate that he was also attacked for his stand on the ministry. He said that at Neuendettelsau they had been taught that its position was Iowa's position and that he had been pledged in writing to adhere to it and that he had been completely disillusioned at his conference.

tion of the synod in this respect.[3] Matter too came to share the view that the confessional position had been changed.

Matter was thus at the center of a group whose views were Missourian, which came to be the dominating influence in an entire conference and whose tendency was to be dissatisfied with toleration and to demand a change in the synodical position, or even to assert that it had already occurred and should be recognized. Through personal contacts with Matter or with classmates who were under his influence a number of young men in the Northern Iowa Conference soon came to hold similar views. The removal of the seminary in 1874 from this conference may have contributed to the spreading influence of this point of view through removal of a check.[4] Farther south in Missouri, Iowa pastors usually held isolated positions and were surrounded by Missouri pastors. There is no evidence of a particular center of agitation in this area, but it was clear in the mid-seventies that some of the pastors were falling under Missouri influence.[5]

---

[3] Strobel had rapidly become prominent and held a district presidency under the provisional arrangement prior to 1873. His position on controversy and unity was made clear in his protest in 1875, Synodalbericht 1875, 23, K. B. XXXIX, 16, 187, reports that he called a special session of the Southern Iowa Conference just before the convention of 1875 in order to present a paper on Iowa's confessional position and to inquire how the conference stood on the issue of the confessional paragraph. The reply indicated unconditional acceptance of the symbols in terms which excluded open questions. A letter, Strobel - Grossmann, March 20, 1875, in I. S. D., declares dissidence with some recent statements of Iowa leaders and adherence to certain Missouri views, though the writer expresses distaste for Missouri's controversial methods. He thought Iowa's position weak and ambiguous and believed that the coming convention should clarify it, although not in Bauer's direction. He lays earlier disagreements with Grossmann to the difference in viewpoints on which he himself had only recently become clear. An earlier letter, dated June 11, 1872, also in I. S. D., vaguely refers to such a disagreement.

[4] Pastor DeJung had earlier been an assistant to Matter and was now at Earlville in eastern Iowa. He was friendly with Vollmar at Elkport, who to judge by a letter, Vollmar - Prof. ?,

Pastor G. A. Schieferdecker, who with the decline of chiliasm had arrived at a point where he was no longer in conflict with Missouri over this question and who may have been influenced by personal tribulations, was anxious to bring

---

Elkport, June 6, 1874, in which he reported on the beginning of his ministry and invited the addressee to his wedding, did not then take the view that he was to take a year later, thus illustrating that the removal of the seminary may have exposed young graduates to unfriendly influences. In Minnesota Missouri influences seem to have been strong, for one young pastor, announced his withdrawal in order to enter Missouri in a letter, Hertrich - Grossmann, Wells, Minnesota, November 9, 1874, while two more were to leave in the next year. These were also young men, acquainted with those who came under Missouri influences in Iowa, but they may have been directly influenced by their environment also. Both letters are in I. S. D. It may be noted that Deindoerfer had complained as early as 1866, that the seminary gave too little attention to the controversial doctrines and that its graduates in consequence were easily led astray, see a letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Toledo, November 28, 1866, in I. S. D. The tendency of recent graduates to fall under Missouri influence substantiates this criticism.

[5] A letter, Dunsing - Grossmann, Florence, Missouri, June 25, 1874, in I. S. D. announced withdrawal in order to join Missouri of this pastor, whom a decade earlier Missouri had pronounced unfit for the ministry. Pastor Doehler, at Altenburg, was a former member of Missouri who had withdrawn because of the usury controversy and who seems to have come under Missouri influence again in his exposed environment, now that this controversy had simmered down.

Missouri and Iowa into agreement.[6] Now stationed in the east, he did not establish a center of his own and seems to have influenced chiefly his immediate neighbor, Pastor W. Kroenke, but he carried on an extensive correspondence with other sections in the synod from which he drew the conviction that a general trend seeking peace with Missouri and ready to admit changes in the former position objectionable to Missouri was gathering headway.[7] In August 1874 he and Kroenke had a meeting with Walther in Schieferdecker's home in which the differences between the synods were discussed. Schieferdecker reported that Walther did not really see church-separating difference any more, but that he could have confidence in Iowa's recent doctrinal declarations only if an admission was made that Iowa had changed position; that he would not accept a declaration that it had been misunderstood. On his own part Schieferdecker believed that both sides had retreated and that the controversy now continued mainly because neither would admit this and concede victory to the opponent. Iowa's course should now be to discuss the entire field of doctrinal controversy at a synodical convention, to establish unanimity of views and to admit such changes as might then be necessary.[8]

---

[6] Missouri had always maintained that Schieferdecker had been excluded for crass chiliasm. At the colloquy this had been strongly asserted and the statement made, that if he had altered his position on the character of the millennium, to hold what Iowa thought he held, he could be readmitted. See Beyer, Colloquium, 155-8. He had reached agreement with Walther on this point by 1874, see letter cited in footnote 8. His position at Altenburg had gradually become unhappy and after transfer, he had briefly served at Maxfield and at Clarion and was then in Ottawa Lake, but did not like the northern climate and suffered from illness. A married daughter had died young and a son, educated at Wartburg and then sent to German universities, had not only not entered the ministry, but lost his faith. It seems probable that these misfortunes may have weighed on him and made him feel that it was his duty to work toward ending the schism. Details on his experiences can be found in a series of Schieferdecker letters in I. S. D.

[7] A letter, Walther - Sieker, St. Louis, February 18, 1875, type copy in I. S. D., attributes this position to Schieferdecker, mentioning that a number of letters expressing similar sentiments, among others from Klindworth and Kleinlein were read to Walther at the meeting to be described immediately. Walther wrote that both Schieferdecker and Kroenke had admitted that differences with Missouri did not rest on misunderstandings, that Iowa had changed its position and that they and others were ready unequivocally to renounce the former position toward the symbols, the open question theory, chiliasm and the progress theory. He also mentioned an alleged trend through the entire synod in this direction. Deindoerfer was aware of Schieferdecker's activities and thought they could only lead to trouble. He suggested that he be called away, letters, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, December 7, 1874; January 7, 1875, in I. S. D.

---

[8] See letters, Schieferdecker - --, Ottawa Lake, August 21; September 24, 1874. The first letter is probably to Klindworth, the second certainly to Grossmann. The first letter said frankly that as he saw it, honesty demanded admission that the synod had changed its position on open questions and the symbols. Unanimity was to be obtained on what was open question and what not. The second letter emphasized that the object of his endeavors was peace between the synods. It enumerated changes on both sides and indicated that Walther had conceded to him that the doctrine of the anti-Christ was not a doctrine of faith, though he still maintained that he could not cooperate with those who denied that the pope was the anti-Christ. He was also ready to make some concession on the transference theory and was less stringent on what was church-separating. Iowa had made changes on the position toward the symbols, open questions and chiliasm. Walther denied having changed and so did Iowa. It would be best not to fight over that issue and Walther would be satisfied, if a definite declaration on what was open question and what error were made. This letter avoided a clear statement of the necessity of confession of error. It is clear that Walther's letter, cited in the preceding footnote differs from this account. Both letters in I. S. D.

While unanimity of views was not to be absolute, Iowa was to declare definitely what was to be considered open question and definitely to reject all errors. Schieferdecker does not seem to have seen that unanimity on that point would be hard to obtain between downright adherents of Missouri views and their opponents.

Gradual formation of a considerable group within the synod which held Missouri's viewpoint on controversial questions tended to confront Iowa with a basic difficulty. Toleration of these views was required by the synodical Richtung, as long as only toleration and freedom to discuss issues was involved. The Missouri Richtung, however, did not confine itself to assertion of specific views, its characteristic was rather to insist on conformity in regard to them. As a fairly strong group of representatives of the Missouri view came into existence, it maintained contacts throughout the synod through consultation and correspondence and began to assume the character of a faction. Through Schieferdecker and Walther it established contact with Missouri's leadership and developed a program for bringing the two synods together. Taking advantage of the undenied fact that certain changes had occurred in Iowa, notably abandonment of the theory of symbolical interpretation, decline of chiliast enthusiasm and modification of some of the earlier viewpoints even by its remaining adherents and of the change of the confessional paragraph, it argued that the synod had in fact fundamentally changed its earlier position. It held that Missouri was right when it maintained that honesty demanded this admission. If it were made, controversy could be ended and the way to membership in the Synodical Conference would be open. Thus it could make a strong appeal to members of the synod who were tired of controversy and isolation and who had grown cool toward the General Council. Since, however, the synodical leadership denied that an essential change of position had taken place and asserted that opponents had misinterpreted Iowa's real position from the beginning, the faction was really demanding a repudiation of that leadership, particularly of the two theological professors. If it did not as yet demand that openly or even see it clearly, Walther did and said so unmistakably.[9]

A strong faction, therefore, centered in Iowa, but possessing able adherents in every section of the synod was active in the direction of making peace with Missouri on

---

[9] Walther wrote that both Schieferdecker and Kroenke had conceded that the Fritschels would oppose a confession of error or change, but that they had said, if the brothers would not yield they would either have to be expelled or the synod would have to break up. He also said that he had insisted on this admission of error and warned that the Fritschels would try to counteract the trend and that he would reject the admission if it were qualified. He had definitely rejected another colloquy, because of the dishonesty of the Fritschels and he would not accept mere concessions on their part. They would have to agree with Missouri on every point or no peace. Walther's letter, cited in footnote 7, contains these observations. It was written to deny rumors that he made concessions to Iowa, and soon became known.

Missouri's terms. It had adopted the view that the synod had formerly held chiliasm as a synodical doctrine, which the leaders had always so strongly denied. It had accepted the resultant contention that the synodical declarations were essentially dishonest and it had accepted Missouri's viewpoints on the anti-Christ and the ministry and was ready to accept a modification of the open question theory. It would agree to minor concessions which gave a limited toleration to individual disagreements, but it demanded a sharply defined synodical position, essentially in line with Missouri. In a word it wished to abandon the Iowa Richtung. Synodical leaders, who wished to maintain the Richtung, must be brought to see the light or repudiated. The individuals who composed this faction were honest and they were not conscious of disloyalty to their synod, they sought peace themselves and they knew that the membership shared that desire. They had, however, absorbed the spirit of Missouri with its doctrines and believed that the sphere of open questions must be limited rigidly and that the synod had been too liberal in this respect. Missouri was well aware of the activities of this group and through Walther had made contact with it. The concentrated attack beginning in 1874 through the Schmidt articles in Missouri's organ, which demanded honest admission of change and openly accused the leaders of dishonesty, was no doubt intended to support the Missouri faction and to bring the rank and file of membership into line.

While these developments were taking place, discord was rife within the synod on other matters. In particular the college question was coming to a head. It had been difficult to finance two institutions ever since the college had been separated from the seminary in 1868. Not only was there a large debt, but deficits were still accruing each year. The removal of the seminary to Mendota and disappointment of hopes that had been placed in the Mendota fund complicated affairs still more. The abandonment of the rural seminary economy bade fair to increase future operating expenses. In many quarters a conviction developed that the synod was overburdened, that financial affairs were poorly managed and that the tendency was toward bankruptcy. On the other hand there were complaints that the offerings were not raised regularly or at all and that lack of good will was the basic trouble. There were also those who felt that the synod suffered from lack of efficient management, that synodical resolutions and even constitutional provisions were not properly enforced. After years of controversy a district system had been adopted in 1873, but the Western District at least was still unwieldly and the new constitution in any case was only provisionally in effect and due for reconsideration. Grievances and discontent arising from contentions over matters such as these were likely to express themselves through opposition to synodical leadership.

In respect to management and business affairs, the chief critic was Pastor J. Klindworth. An able man, he had become prominent in synodical affairs almost from the time of his admission in 1858.[10] There had never been the slightest question of his loyalty to his synod from which he had received positions of trust and which he served ably and unstintingly. Klindworth had long shown an interest in constitutional matters. While he was, for a time at least, opposed to district synods, his reason seems to have been that centralized management under one president would be more efficient. His record indicates that he believed the synod to need a definite and well understood system of regulations and consistent and regular enforcement, with impersonal procedure and centralized in responsible officials. In the mid-seventies he was dissatisfied not so much with the system as with the way in which it was being handled.[11] Klindworth had been chiefly responsible for the separation of the college from the seminary. He had in consequence become deeply involved in the financial difficulties that ensued and, although his own financial procedures were not beyond reproach, had come to feel strongly that those of the seminary were mishandled. As it began to seem likely that the result would be a recombination of the two institutions, his irritation drove him into opposition to necessary seminary arrangements at Mendota or even the transfer itself.[12] Defeated on these points, he under-

---

[10] He had in the early years taken prominent part in the affairs of the Indian mission, had been interested in the Andrew orphanage since its beginning, was rector of the college, had served as vice-president in charge of a provisional district and was in 1875 a member of the Ausschuss. He usually played a prominent role at synodical conventions also and seems to have exercised a great influence.

[11] It will be remembered that he had submitted a draft for the constitution of 1864 and later others for new synodical and congregational constitutions. A letter, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, May 3, 1871, in I. S. D., discusses the constitution he was then drafting. All pastors were to know definitely what was expected of them, a strong executive was to have adequate powers. He realized that opponents would criticize his basic ideas. Letters, March 4; April 24, 1872, in I. S. D., criticized Grossmann's handling of a given case, because he believed the president to have proceeded on basis of subjective convictions rather than impersonal investigation. See also a letter, Wachtel - Grossmann, New Hampton, February 6,

---

1872, in I. S. D. Klindworth's *Traurige Zustaende* abounds in criticism of administrative irregularities, but does not clearly focus his criticism, because it was directed against the Fritschels rather than Grossmann. In regard to them he quotes a judgment from Bauer, that they were not financially and administratively talented, p. 7. His defense of his refusal to admit the special visitation committee at Galena in 1875 is based on the consideration that the entire procedure was irregular and that constitutional procedures were set aside, pp. 10-15, see also *Zeugniss*, 19-20. *K. B.* XXXIX, 16, 186, indicates that the Matter group originally also took an interest in constitutional questions. It opposed district synods in 1869 and Matter worked out a plan under which conference chairmen would have received church governmental functions. In 1871 the conference resolved to ask the synod to abolish districts and urged this expansion of conference functions. Clearly, however, these views, though they indicate critical attitudes in regard to administrative and constitutional questions, do not agree in detail with those of Klindworth. The group also differed from him in that it favored a reunion of college and seminary.

[12] See chapter XII for details on financial difficulties and Klindworth's complaints on this account. It should be noted that he did not personally handle college finances or keep the books. *Traurige Zustaende*, 12, brings an excerpt from a letter from Bauer, which states that closing the college at Galena would not solve financial difficulties which stemmed from mismanagement. P. 6, he writes that the two cancers which were ruining the synod were the theology of its professors and the administration of the synodical educational institutions. In correspondence to be cited later, there is evidence that Klindworth's letters to Germany strongly criticized alleged financial mismanagement.

took to organize the existing discontent against a synodical leadership which he thought determined to put an end to the separate existence of the college.

Klindworth was a practical man of affairs rather than a theological scholar.[13] Although he had shared the Neuendettelsau views in his early days, he seems long since to have lost his interest in them and to have been little concerned about the synodical Richtung.[14] While he was not in agreement with the doctrinal views of the Missouri faction, he adopted their contention that synod had changed its position, particularly he came to contend that it had adopted chiliasm as official synodical doctrine in 1858 and later abandoned it, and he also took the view that the alteration of the confessional paragraph at Davenport meant a change in confessional position. Accordingly he was ready to contend that honesty demanded an admission of such changes.[15] On this basis Klindworth entered into personal contacts and correspondence with the members of the Missouri faction and became an active leader in an opposition group within the synod. In 1874, as already noted, he carried on extensive agitation for the convocation of a special convention to deal with institutional problems, drawing in a number of pastors, who were not connected with the Missouri faction. Although he did not then gain his end, the special convention was eventually called for 1875.

---

[13] Only one theological article by Klindworth appeared in Iowa publications, on predestination. In his cited letter of May 3, 1871, he took the position that theological discussions did not belong before conventions, unless the synod was divided on controversial issues. Since in earlier conventions doctrinal discussions had played a large role, this would indicate that Klindworth was more interested in practical matters than in theological controversy. A friendly German source remarked of him, "Wir vermissten bei ihm, einen in sich durchgebildeten theol. Standpunct," in a letter, Deinzer - Deindoerfer, Neuendettelsau, August 26, 1875, after Klindworth had visited Germany and participated in a thoroughgoing discussion of the synod's position and his own part in the convention of 1875. In a letter, Klindworth - Duerschner, Galena, March 11, 1876, in I. S. D., Klindworth asserted that his controversy with the Fritschels had recently led him to make scriptural studies, which convinced him that they were wrong. He now rejected all chiliasm as well as open questions and stood for an unqualified quia on the symbols. The letter is mutilated and not all statements are complete.

[14] Bericht...Untersuchung, 34, indicates that Klindworth's early views on chiliasm went farther than those of the theological professors. The type copy of a portion of the minutes of 1864 in I. S. D. indicates that Klindworth advocated omission of the Richtungsparagraph of 1854 and remarked, "Uebrigens kann ich auch der Richtung keine so gar grosse Bedeutung geben." The remark was in reply to a statement by S. Fritschel which held the Richtung essential. A letter, Klindworth - Grossmann, Galena, July 13, 1864, indicates in relation to other matters that Klindworth then was critical of Neuendettelsau attitudes. The letter is in I. S. D.

The charge was subsequently to be levied against Klindworth that he had thrown the synod into disturbance through persistent agitation. Since 1873, so it was charged, he had made contacts with the Missouri faction, with men who were opposed to the General Council, with any one who had a grudge or grievance, in order to draw together a party opposed to existing synodical leadership, with the object particularly of destroying the influence of the theological professors and of driving them out of the synod. Though Klindworth denied charges of agitation,[16] it is quite clear that he was in touch with the Missouri faction and that he influenced other pastors, not connected with it, against the synodical leadership.[17] There can be little doubt that Klindworth had come to regard the theological professors, particularly S. Fritschel, with hostility and that he had made common cause with a faction, which was opposed to their position and that he tried to draw others into an opposition group of his own. While he may have had a number of purposes in mind, of which he thought that synodical welfare demanded them,[18] it is probable that preservation of the separate institution of Galena was his fundamental purpose.[19]

---

[15] Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 39-47, deals with chiliasm, Zeugniss, 41-45, refers to both chiliasm and the confessional paragraph, but does not explain the contradiction on the latter point arising from Klindworth's 1873 statement that no change was intended and his present contention that a change took place, but simply asserts that at the time of writing, Klindworth saw much more change than earlier. A letter, Deinzer - --, Neuendettelsau, August 24, 1875, in I. S. D., probably to G. Fritschel reported that Klindworth defended his contention that a change had taken place, but found that otherwise there was little difference in his views from those asserted at Madison in 1875.

---

[16] The charge of agitation was publicly stated in *K. B.* XVII, 93, and *Synodalbericht*, *1875*, 24. Klindworth, *Traurige Zustaende*, 23-28, carried a denial, which is unconvincing, because it deals only with incidents occurring immediately before and during the convention of 1875. A reference to the subject in *Zeugniss*, 39-40, evades the evidence that had been submitted to the committee on investigation on the first pamphlet.

[17] Klindworth did not deny his contacts with the Missouri faction, though he maintained that he did not agitate among them. *Bericht*...*Untersuchung*, 12-13, gives specific instances, which Klindworth passed over with the remark that the last statement was a lie. Pastors Foelsch, Bredow and Luz repeatedly testified that Klindworth had influenced them against the synodical leadership, *e. g.*, p. 88. It is possible that Klindworth's efforts in this direction date much farther back. A letter, Deindoerfer - Klindworth, Toledo, March 8, 1868, dealing with a colloquy of 1867, indicates that Klindworth had asked him to resume a correspondence and to express himself on the colloquy and the General Council. A remark that Deindoerfer, though critical of colloquy concessions, did not doubt the good intentions of the Wartburgers may mean that Klindworth had expressed himself otherwise. A statement in 1873 by Hoerlein that Klindworth had insisted on establishment of the college in Galena in 1868 in order to create an opposition to Wartburg is in *Bericht*...*Untersuchung*, 89. The letters of Hoerlein cited by Klindworth, *Traurige Zustaende*, 83-7, in themselves indicate that Hoerlein's mind had been poisoned.

While an opposition movement thus was agitating within the synod, the relationship with Neuendettelsau was deteriorating almost to the breaking point. Though the strain of the late sixties had been eased, a coolness seems to have persisted. Bauer seems to have felt that the synodical leaders were treating him with studied neglect.[20] No synodical officer reported the Davenport theses or explained the alteration of the confessional paragraph to Neuendettelsau.[21] Not long afterward, however, Bauer heard from a young pastor in Iowa, that in his conference the Missouri trend was prevalent and that he himself with different convictions was barely tolerated.[22] At the same time Bauer heard from the Klindworth group, which attacked the theological professors and financial management in letters to him. He had always been in correspondence with Kroenke, who at this time reported on his interview with Walther and criticized financial management and admissions policies of the synod, though defending the professors.[23]

---

[18] The cited letter from Deinzer, August 24, 1875, states that Klindworth gave the following purposes in Germany: admission of a modification of synod's position; a reserved position toward the General Council; cessation of controversy with Missouri; concentration on synod's practical tasks; more emphasis on discipline, particularly against secret societies. Deinzer did not say so, but this sounds like the platform of a leader, who had placed himself in power by combining the support of number of factions and planned a program designed to give each group some measure of satisfaction.

[19] In another letter, Deinzer - Grossmann, N. D., June 22, 1876, in I. S. D., Deinzer states that he knew that Klindworth's opposition sprang essentially from the fear that the college would be abolished. Bericht...Untersuchung, 18, brings a letter written by Klindworth in 1874 in which he advocated that several conferences should threaten to leave the synod, if Grossmann should refuse to call a special convention in that year. He considered it unthinkable that Grossmann would refuse in the face of that threat. If he should, the conferences would secede, form a separate division of the synod, take the college along, transform it into a seminary and be rid of Mendota debts. Although Klindworth clearly did not expect this to happen, his plan, taken together with Hoerlein's assertion in regard to 1868 may give an indication of his inmost thoughts. P. 43 brings a discussion of Klindworth's aversion to S. Fritschel, who considered him a friend. Lutz, who was close to Klindworth, asserted that the aversion had existed as long as Lutz had known him. It is not impossible that Klindworth was driven by ambition and had gradually convinced himself that the welfare of the synod, to which he was loyal, demanded the removal of men whom he distrusted from the central position of influence which they held.

---

[20] A fragment of a letter in Bauer's hand, undated and unsigned, but evidently written by him in 1871 to a synodical leader is in I. S. D. It refers to unfriendly treatment of S. Fritschel by Loehe in 1870, but assigns it to failings of age, attaches no great significance to it and indicates that Fritschel parted from Neuendettelsau amicably. It complains, however, that Fritschel had not written since then. Though still in Germany, he had not attended the dedication of the second building at Neuendettelsau or even sent congratulations, which seems to have rankled particularly. He had not replied to a letter inquiring about rumors that an accident had befallen him in Russia, nor had he reported his safe arrival in America, though other rumors had spread that his ship had met disaster. No one in America had written to express sympathy over ravages from the war of 1870 which had affected Neuendettelsau severely. No one had explained the arrangement with Melsungen, about which they had read in the papers and some thought that Iowa had made new friends whom it liked better. Deinzer's cited letter to Deindoerfer, August 26, 1875, makes similar complaints. Neuendettelsau heard about Melsungen incidentally through a letter from Vilmar, it learned the name of Luebtheen only, when someone from there happened to pass through. Clearly the German fathers had cause for complaint, but the writer has found no indications that any synodical leader nursed grievances before 1873. It seems probable that thoughtless neglect rather than grudges were responsible. In regard to S. Fritschel it may be said that the war of 1870 broke out while he was making his third visit and that it seems to have hampered his movements. The dedication took place October 19, 1870. According to K. B. XIV, 9, 69, Fritschel left Germany within a week of that date and could barely arrange to be present at another dedication in Hamburg on October 23. Bauer himself mentioned that the war prevented carrying out a plan, according to which S. Fritschel was to accompany him to Hamburg for this occasion. It seems probable that Fritschel did not intentionally stay away from the Neuendettelsau occasion, and that pressure of affairs with war-disrupted communications prevented him from writing in time, though he should have sent a note of regret.

---

[21] Deinzer's cited letter of August 26 makes this statement. Another letter, Deinzer - --, N. D., August 24, 1875, in I. S. D., probably to G. Fritschel, remarks that much misunderstanding could have been avoided if as many American letters had arrived in the preceding three years as had been received during the last three months, and refers particularly to failure of synodical leaders to write to Bauer in recent years.

[22] The reference was to the Southern Iowa Conference and the Matter group, see footnote 2.

[23] The letter, Kroenke - Deindoerfer, Riga, November 28, 1875, in Deindoerfer Papers, explains Kroenke's part in the estrangement. He wrote that in his previous correspondence with Bauer he had rarely touched on synodical affairs. Through Bredow, then under Klindworth influence, he saw a Bauer reply to the Galena group, which indicated attacks on the professors. To defend them the better he frankly admitted evils in the system, but vindicated their integrity. He also denied a desire to join Missouri or even the Synodical Conference and defended Iowa's Richtung. That Klindworth himself and others of his group corresponded with Bauer was not denied. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, December 7, 1874, in I. S. D., refers to a long letter to Germany by Preller. K. M., printed lists of letters received from America in 1872 and 1873, but none for the next few years. In those years listed S. Fritschel wrote two, G. Fritschel one, Deindoerfer two, Grossmann five (four in 1873), Klindworth only one (in 1873), Kroenke seven, K. M., N. F. V, 2, 15; VI, 3, 21-22.

In the last months of his life, Bauer thus felt that the leaders of the synod were giving Neuendettelsau a cold shoulder and read sharp attacks upon them from former students whom he trusted.[24] When he studied the Davenport theses in this frame of mind, he concluded that they abandoned his own positions and took a neutral stand which he disapproved.[25] The alteration of the confessional paragraph seemed to him to mark definite abandonment of the Neuendettelsau Richtung. The synod had changed its position, but had failed to admit this openly. Its theological professors were dishonestly using ambiguous language and then giving varying interpretations of it according to the purpose to be served.[26] The synod now had only the choice of recanting and returning to its former position or of frankly admitting former error and going over into the Missouri camp.[27]

---

[24] It is probable that Bauer objected to the Davenport theses at once and wrote to Grossmann about it. A letter, Deindoerfer - Bauer, Defiance, November 8, 1873, in I. S. D., writes of returning a letter from Bauer with the statement that the writer cannot understand why it made Grossmann so angry. Bauer must have the right to state contrary opinions even on synodical resolutions. Deindoerfer pleads that Grossmann should not carry out his intention to break off personal correspondence and communicate with Bauer only through the synodical secretary. If he felt that the criticism could not be overlooked, he had best make friendly complaints directly to the old inspector. Otherwise grave difficulties would ensue for the synod. There is no record of what Grossmann did, but it is not impossible that Bauer sensed his resentment.

[25] Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 6, quotes a strong judgment from Bauer, "'das ist eine Theologie, dass Gott erbarm'...Das ist die Frucht der herrlichen Vermittelungstheologie, die euern Theologen den Ruhm eines Bucers nicht mit Unrecht eingetragen hat." The Schmidt articles compared the Fritschels with Bucer.

When Bauer had come to these conclusions he undertook to lay them before the synodical authorities through a long memorandum, usually referred to as Bauer's *Denkschrift*.[28] After reporting the state of affairs to the *Gesellschaft*, he received a short leave of absence for reasons of health and used this to write his document.[29] He completed it in November and within a month he was dead.[30] Before his death Bauer summarized the contents of his memorandum in a letter which was sent to every Neuendettelsau graduate in the Iowa Synod. The Denkschrift itself was signed by the officers of the

---

[26] Kroenke's cited letter of November 28, 1875, reports that these were Bauer's sentiments, expressed in reply to Kroenke's defense of the professors. Bauer also charged Kroenke with blindly leading the synod into the Missouri camp. He retracted these charges, but maintained his judgment on the professors and wrote that he wanted no future defense made out of blind trust. Kroenke seems personally to have been on good terms with the Fritschels, a letter, Kroenke - G. Fritschel, Riga, September 21, 1874, in I. S. D., refers to a recent visit to Mendota. It may have been knowledge of this relationship that caused Bauer to reject Kroenke's defense. Another letter, M. Loehe - S. Fritschel, March 3, 1875, in I. S. D., from a personal friend, mentions that Bauer had long distrusted S. Fritschel and blames him for readily listening to reports which nourished his suspicions.

[27] *Chronik*, 119.

[28] Kroenke's letter of November 28, 1875, says that Kroenke replied to Bauer's strictures on the Fritschels by asking him not to listen to correspondents whose judgment was poor or vitiated by personal motives. Instead of breaking with the synod he might write a *Denkschrift* and await results. While synod would not return to the chiliasm of 1858 which would reduce it to a few members and while it would maintain toleration for different *Richtungen*, Bauer would find its reply satisfactory. Kroenke stated that the *Denkschrift* was Bauer's reply. It is, of course, possible that Bauer had already thought of this course himself.

---

[29] K. M., N. F. VI, 9, 71, omits the relevant portion of Bauer's annual report, because it was said to be difficult so to present it that it would not be misunderstood. The account mentions the Davenport theses and indicates that through them Iowa had taken an untenable position over against Missouri and abandoned the right to contradict its extravagances through Scriptures. Iowa would have to reconsider its change of position or it would be charged with ambiguity. Deindoerfer wrote that through this passage he sensed that trouble was brewing and that through Kroenke he learned then, that Bauer considered Iowa to have entered the Missouri wake and his own lifework to be lost. Galena influences had contributed to this impression, but were hardly the major cause. Bauer was old and allowed young favorites to shape his judgments. Deindoerfer doubted that a good relationship could be permanently restored. The letter also mentions that the writer had heard of the Matter faction and that its activities justified Bauer's views to some extent. Perhaps it would all end in the denunciation of the pioneers of the synod as heretics by youthful successors, letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, December 7, 1874, in I. S. D. Two subsequent letters to Grossmann, January 7; February 9, 1875, refer to Schieferdecker's activities and to misunderstanding of approaches to Missouri in Germany and oppose negotiations with Missouri as useless. They sound less pessimistic than the first, but from Deindoerfer's reaction Bauer's pessimism becomes understandable.

[30] Chronik, 120, gives the Denkschrift date as November 21, 1874. A letter, Deinzer - Grossmann, N. D., December 17, 1875, also signed by Wucherer, in I. S. D., gives Bauer's death date as December 13, 1874. The letter states that the future of the Iowa Synod was his exclusive concern up to the end, fear that his lifework there might be lost found expression in the delirium of his last hours. This letter states that Bauer used his leave to write the Denkschrift, when it was completed he lay down to die. Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 35, stated that Mrs. Bauer believed that her husband would still be living a year later, if it had not been for the American troubles. M. Loehe's letter cited in footnote 26 takes quite a different tone.

Gesellschaft and sent to Grossmann and the Ausschuss.[31] Bauer's basic contention was that the Iowa Synod had originally stood for an open-minded attitude in theological research, which believed that beyond the binding articles of faith in the symbols there lay an area of controversial doctrines, where scriptural study might lead to a realization of truths which in time might be added to the doctrinal treasures of the church. Its special function was to maintain this position over against a Missouri traditionalism which held that doctrinal development had come to an end in the Reformation period and which must lead to a rigid, dead orthodoxy. The synod had, however, not remained faithful to its mission. It had begun to yield to the first attacks and had gradually narrowed its position. It had almost completely abandoned its chiliast views, though they were of great value for the purpose of strengthening faith. It had changed its position on the symbols, substituting vague and ambiguous phrases for an intelligible and positive stand. In the Davenport theses it had also narrowed the concept of open questions to a point where it became meaningless and then changed the confessional paragraph accordingly. Thus sacrificing point after point the synod had now arrived at an untenable position, and seemed to be steering toward complete acceptance of the Missouri trend. Neuendettelsau could no longer give it support unless the original confessional paragraph were restored or an equivalent declaration given.

---

[31] The Denkschrift is no longer extant, or at least its present whereabouts are unknown. Nor do the I. S. D. contain any of the summaries sent to individual pastors. Chronik, 119-20, reports dates (the summaries were dated, November 30, 1875) and other data and gives the demand to return to the original confessional paragraph. It also states that Bauer was awaiting synodical action on this demand, before breaking off the relationship. Deindoerfer, who had seen the Denkschrift, discusses the situation, but gives only the briefest indication of its content, Geschichte, 138-9, noting that Bauer complained that changes in synodical position had occurred without consultation with the Gesellschaft. K. M., N. F. VII, 3, 17-21; 5, 38-9, reports that the Denkschrift was too long to be printed there (it took an entire session of the convention of 1875 to hear it read), but discusses the attitude of the Gesellschaft toward Missouri with some quotations. A reply was written by S. and G. Fritschel at Grossmann's request and sent before the convention met, Chronik, 120, of which a type copy is in the I. S. D., Schreiben der Professoren S. und G. Fritschel an die Gesellschaft f. i. M. als Antwort auf die Denkschrift des sel. Inspektors Bauer. From this and K. M. the following indication of content was gathered. It may be noted that the reply states specifically that the Davenport theses had no connection with the alteration of the confessional paragraph. It denied any intention of going over to Missouri, defended the synodical position, and indicated that Neuendettelsau still held the old position on the binding character only of thetical statements in the symbols which Iowa had abandoned, and that it held open questions to be matters which had not yet found symbolical fixation.

The special convention of 1875 had been called to discuss problems of the educational institutions. As the time for its assembly approached these problems, pressing as they might be, were overshadowed. Tensions had been building up with explosive force. The Missouri faction came to the convention intent upon pressing upon it the necessity of admitting and retracting past error. Klindworth and his Galena group were ready to make common cause with them up to a certain point. The Denkschrift, though it demanded a return to a former position rather than its retraction, maintained that the synod had actually effected an essential change of position which was hidden under ambiguous phrases and thus joined in the very cry which Missouri's organ was shouting from the housetops. If friend and foe alike came to this result, could that really be due to misunderstanding and misinterpretation? Almost on the eve of the convention Grossmann's health gave way, a serious breakdown made it impossible for him to attend the convention and compelled him to turn his duties over to Deindoerfer, who was himself so unwell that he doubted whether he could preside.[32] These two men would be affected inevitably and vitally by the approaching tempest of controversy, its force, however, was directed primarily at Sigmund and Gottfried Fritschel.

---

[32] A letter, Grossmann - Deindoerfer, Mendota, May 3, 1875, in I. S. D., informs the recipient of the breakdown and requests him to take charge of the convention. Grossmann resigned all his synodical offices, the convention, however, did not accept his resignation as president, though he was relieved as president of the Western District. Deindoerfer was instructed to act as president until Grossmann could resume his duties, which was not until the following year, Synodalbericht 1875, 30. Both Grossmann and Deindoerfer had been in poor health for some time, while a letter, Koeberle - Grossmann, Peoria, February 27, 1875, in I. S. D., indicates that both Fritschels were also ill during the winter. The strain under which the synodical leadership was laboring may have had something to do with this. A letter, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, April 11, 1875, in I. S. D., despite the date, contains a reply to Grossmann's request to take charge. Deindoerfer wrote that he would open the convention and ask it to elect its chairman, exciting sessions would ruin him. He did preside, however. In a letter to Klindworth already cited, March 3, 1868, in I. S. D., Deindoerfer had written that it was his private opinion, not to be stated publicly, that Iowa had begun to retreat in the direction of the Missouri camp and that the time would soon come when it would be in a position of having to repent for past offenses against what Missouri considered truth. Ironically it now fell to him to preside seven years later at a convention where exactly that was to be demanded.

The opening session of the convention heard the Denkschrift read. Objections were raised to a proposal that the reply written by the theological professors be read also, on the ground that the debate on the issues raised should not be influenced by an unofficial reply.[33] After some debate on this point it was decided, not to read the entire reply at once, but to hear it in sections at relevant points during the debate. The convention then took up the question whether the position of the synod toward the symbols was now really different from what it had formerly been.[34] A long and acrimonious debate ensued in which Schieferdecker, Klindworth, Matter, Kleinlein among others emphatically gave a positive answer. They gave particular stress to chiliasm and maintained both that it had been made a synodical doctrine in 1858 and that prior to the colloquy of 1867 it had been a crass chiliasm. Since it no longer was crass and since it was no longer a synodical doctrine, denial of a change of position flew into the face of truth and merited charges of dishonesty. The fact that both Missouri and Neuendettelsau from opposite points of view asserted such a change was adduced as proof.[35] Defense against these contentions was conducted almost entirely by the theological professors.[36] They admitted that it was possible to interpret the synodical report of 1858 in the sense of the opposition, but pointed to contrary declarations at ensuing sessions, which clarified a contrary intention. Crass chiliasm could not be honestly acknowledged, because it had never existed. While modifications of chiliast convictions had taken place in detail, they had been openly avowed. Neuendettelsau had been misled by reports that the synod was about to go over to Missouri and had because of this seen a meaning in the alteration of the confessional paragraph which could not be acknowledged, because it had not been intended.[37]

---

[33] Klindworth raised the objection. It is clear that he was irked by Grossmann's failure to call a session of the Ausschuss to draft a reply and that he blamed the Fritschels for this, Traurige Zustaende, 38-9. Bericht...Untersuchung, 31-32, brings a statement by Grossmann on this point. The Denkschrift was addressed to him and the Ausschuss, but he was asked to reply. He thought it inadvisable to circulate the document and unnecessary to call an Ausschuss meeting before the convention and thus instructed the Fritschels to write a reply. Since the Ausschuss consisted of Grossmann, Deindoerfer, S. Fritschel, Schieferdecker, and Klindworth, Grossmann may have realized that unanimous agreement was improbable. Since he could be sure of Deindoerfer's concurrence with himself and S. Fritschel on the points at issue, he probably deemed it wiser not to call a session, in which Klindworth and Schieferdecker would be outvoted, especially since he intended to submit the Denkschrift to the convention, where the opposition would have its opportunity.

[34] The question was one of several points, not specified, raised by Schieferdecker. Preller, of Galena, made the motion to take it up, Synodalbericht 1875, 8. The Missouri and Galena groups were thus in concert on this point.

---

[35] Synodalbericht 1875, 7-8. Kleinlein belonged to the Galena group and probably had followers among a small group of pastors in Illinois, who soon left the synod. Bericht... Untersuchung, 12, indicates that agreement on attitudes toward secret societies brought Kleinlein into the Galena group, while p. 86 indicates that he took an extreme position on this point on which he had clashed with S. Fritschel. It is not impossible that personal animus also played a part in determining Kleinlein's attitude. See K. M. 1855, 2, 10-11; 3, 23; Lutheraner, XVII, 21, 162; and a letter, Kleinlein - Grossmann, Keokuk Junction, April 19, 1872, in I. S. D.

[36] Lutheraner, XXXI, 18, 137-8, states that only four members took part in the debate on the side of the professors, who mostly argued their own case. It may be noted that Pastor Allwardt of Missouri witnessed the proceedings from the balcony and wrote a report entirely from Missouri's point of view which appeared in the organ of that synod XXXI, 17, 129-31; 18, 137-8. Exchanges on this report can be found, Lutheraner XXXII, 6, 45; K. B. XIX, 8, 59-60.

The opposition group also asserted that the synod had changed its position toward the symbols by dropping all the elements of the former Richtungsparagraph, and adopted the formula that all doctrines of faith in the symbols were binding. In return it was readily admitted that these changes had been made and pointed out that they had been publicly avowed in 1867 both at the synodical convention and at the colloquy. The change, however, did not mean that doctrines of faith formerly rejected were now accepted. The opposition was challenged to name a single doctrine of which this was true. The Richtung of the synod continued as it had been, the dropping of the paragraph had not been intended to abandon it. Two entire days were spent debating these contentions, both sides maintaining their positions strongly, while the charge of dishonesty was reiterated and sometimes stated offensively.[38]

---

[37] Synodalbericht 1875, 8-9.

[38] Ibid., 9-10. Bericht...Untersuchung, 85-6, brings a statement from a lay delegate, who had at Madison taken offense at the proceedings and who in the statement says that what happened was a sin and a shame and that one pastor uttered personal insults against S. Fritschel. Deindoerfer, Geschichte refers to the proceedings as "sehr erregt," p. 141, and states that the Klindworth group incessantly charged its opponents with dishonesty, pp. 140-1. Chronik, 120, also states that

On the third day Klindworth moved that the synod declare, that it as a synod did not represent a particular Richtung, and that it must unconditionally adhere to the form of the confessional paragraph adopted in the constitution at Davenport. In defense of this motion he pointed out that several *Richtungen* were actually represented in the synod and that a church must allow some leeway for varying opinions on subordinate points in its midst. The degree to which this could be done needed to be discussed. The theological professors saw a basis for arriving at an understanding in this motion. They were not entirely satisfied with it and thought it needed rewording, so as to exclude the possibility of an interpretation that synod was thereby changing its position, but they held that it expressed the actual *Richtung*, as it had gradually become established. At the time of the organization the founders had taken the *Neuendettelsau* *Richtung* for granted, and had failed to distinguish between synodical doctrine and personal conviction. When the differentiation had become clear, the synod contrary to Bauer's wishes had refused to represent the *Neuendettelsau* *Richtung* as a synod, with the doctrines which the *Denkschrift* stressed as synodical doctrines, but had developed its own Richtung by taking the position that such doctrines were not unlutheran and that differences concerning them were non-church-separating. They asserted that

---

the two Fritschels and others who agreed with them were branded as dishonest and unwilling to admit an actual change. Klindworth, *Traurige* *Zustaende*, 45-6, also maintains that the question of honesty was the focal point of the controversy.

they now had no desire to reverse this position and commit the synod to the Denkschrift doctrines, their purpose was merely to continue to leave room for those who held them. But while Klindworth's motion was essentially acceptable to the defenders of the synodical position, it was not in accord with the desires of the Missouri faction. A division between that group and the Galena adherents therefore became apparent. The debate consumed another entire day and an evening session was finally ordered to conclude it.[39]

Prior to the evening session, Klindworth and a number of other pastors held a caucus. When the session opened Klindworth offered a series of resolutions: the synod was to declare that it considered the Richtungsparagraph of 1854 which had been maintained until 1864 untenable, and explicitly to make a statement of retraction, while at the same time declaring adherence to the Davenport formulation of the confessional paragraph; this point was not to be debated, only the question was to be put; in the next session consideration was to be given a motion to break off the relationship with the General Council.[40] These resolutions were rejected with some indignation as contrary to the purpose of the session, unacceptable and confusing. It was pointed out that the Klindworth group kept shifting its ground with varying proposals and resolutions and voice was given to the suspicion that an end, not attainable by regular means, was sought.[41]

---

[39] Synodalbericht 1875, 10. Bredow, Erinnerungen, 145-9, discusses this affair and states that Klindworth originally controlled a majority. Bredow was a member of the Galena group himself originally, but came to change his mind at Madison. It seems doubtful, however, whether the statement about the majority is accurate, for Klindworth might then have pressed for an early vote on the Preller resolution. Bredow wrote that the purpose of Klindworth was to force the Fritschels out and to reorganize the synod with himself at the head of it. This undoubtedly represents a conclusion arrived at later, rather than testimony of a participant in a plot.

On the following morning the defending side brought in a set of resolutions, which came to be known as the Madison theses. In regard to Richtung and symbols they declared that the synod as a synod did not represent the Richtung of any particular school, but that it simply accepted the symbols and considered all doctrines of faith in them as binding. It tolerated differences of theological opinion in its midst within confessional limits and regarded it as grave sin to make doctrines of faith of points, which were not such, and to make church fellowship dependent on them. It rejected all so-called progress in doctrine which conflicted with the foundation of the symbols. In regard to alteration of the confessional paragraph, the theses rejected the interpretation that it constituted a change of confessional position and pointed out that no doctrines of faith could be named which had formerly been rejected and were now accepted. The present form would, however, be retained, because it was simpler, less easily understood and less objectionable.

---

[40] Synodalbericht 1875, 11. Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 24, maintains that the motion on the Richtung was only the earlier resolution offered by himself in more definite form, so that all possibility of misunderstanding should be excluded. It is quite clear from the debate as already discussed, that the professors had quite a different understanding of its meaning. The probability, therefore, is that Klindworth here yielded to pressure from the Missouri faction. Klindworth presents the evening session as merely a discussion group and indicates that the caucus was convinced of the uselessness of further discussion, because all its members doubted the honesty of the professors. Bericht...Untersuchung, 11, confirms the character of the evening session, points out the inadmissibility of a vote, indicates that the character of Klindworth's Richtung resolution contradicted his statements during the day, and gives the explanation already suggested. The Council resolution is presented as a change of tactics. If the attack on the Richtung should fail, a majority could be secured against the professors on this point, p. 12, 13. Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende, 25-6, Zeugniss, 39-40, does not really meet this point.

[41] Synodalbericht, 1875, 11.

On specific doctrines, the symbolical statements on the ministry were accepted, but the transference theory was declared not to be a doctrine of faith nor even a symbolical doctrine. True Lutherans must concur in the symbolical judgment that the papacy had anti-christic characteristics, but the doctrine that the pope is the anti-Christ was not a doctrine of faith. Symbolical judgments on chiliasm were accepted also, but it was maintained that they did not exclude development of eschatological doctrine on basis of prophecies, as long as this development remained in harmony with fundamental doctrines. Specific reference was made in this connection to the declaration of 1864 on this point. The doctrine of certain old theologians that Sunday observance was not a matter of free choice for the church, but that it rested upon a divine decree at the time of creation, was not a doctrine of faith, nor should it be considered a church-separating departure from the confessions. In regard to open questions finally, the point of view was rejected that they were points of doctrine decided in scriptures which must remain open until the church had agreed upon them. The expression meant simply non-church-separating questions and could readily be dropped for a more acceptable term.[42]

A long debate ensued over the Madison theses, particularly those referring to Richtung, confessional paragraph, and open questions. The Missouri faction opposed some points as leaving too much leeway for error and pointed against Missouri, expressing the hope that another colloquy could be held. When the challenge to name doctrines of faith formerly rejected was repeated in a discussion on the confessional paragraph, the transference theory and the anti-Christ doctrine were named, but they were rejected as not such doctrines and not even now accepted by the synod. When it became clear that unanimous agreement could not be obtained, the majority adopted these theses and resolved to send them to the Gesellschaft in reply to the Denkschrift.[43] Five different protests were then submitted, signed by fourteen pastors.[44] The first of these was signed by members of the Missouri faction and enumerated a number of points, which were not to be considered open questions. The synod issued a reply which agreed on one point and defined its position on the others.[45] The Klindworth group protested that the synod had changed its Richtung and offered to agree to an interpretation of the relevant statement, permitting the assertion that it retracted adherence formerly given to the Neuendettelsau Richtung. The synod made a reply which implied that there could be no retraction of a Richtung never officially professed, but granted that the synod as such did not represent any particular Richtung.[46]

---

[42] Ibid., 11-19. The Madison theses are also in Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 141-3. They were written by G. Fritschel.

[43] Ibid., 11-20. Missouri comments on the Madison theses are in Lehre und Wehre, XXI, 10, 289-303.

---

[44] A number of pastors signed more than one protest, fourteen was the total number of signers. Several of them had indicated their intention of doing so during the debate.

[45] Protest No. 1 was signed by Schieferdecker, Matter, Strobel, Zlomke, Dejung, Vollmar. On basis of the fact that the synod would not concede change of position they stated that they conceived the synod to hold that the doctrine, that the church is essentially a communion of believers, was open and they did not. The synod replied that it did not consider this point an open question. They also held that the doctrine that the church held the office of the keys in the spiritual priesthood of believers was not an open question and that belief in a double return of Christ and double resurrection were contrary to scriptural truth and that the doctrine of the pope as anti-Christ, while not a doctrine of faith, was so rooted in the conscience of the church that it must be considered symbolical doctrine. The synod replied that it considered the office of the keys as given to the church, not to individuals, and held this to be doctrine of faith, only the transference theory was open. The chiliast points were held open as qualified at the colloquy, Ibid., 21.

[46] Protest No. 2 was signed by Klindworth, Preller, Lutz, Kleinlein, Westenberger, Braeuer, Schulenburg and by error by Vollmar, Ibid., 22.

The remaining protests were from individual pastors most of whom had already signed others and received no reply.[47]

The convention then considered the relationship of the synod to those who had signed the protests. Declaration was made that the synod could tolerate differences not touching faith and would not object to Missouri viewpoints. If pastors holding them, however, thought the differences church-separating and would cause disturbances, it would be immoral for them to remain in a synod which had definitely declared the differences non-church-separating, and sinful to carry on agitation in its midst. Pastors Matter, Strobel, and Schieferdecker thereupon withdrew from membership.[48] The convention then issued a reprimand to several pastors who had signed the second protest without making any statement before it, several of whom had already left the city or had ceased to attend the sessions. It also reprimanded the agitation of which some of them had been guilty. Inquiries were to be made of them, how they stood toward the synod and whether they would promise to abstain from further agitation. Those whose replies were unsatisfactory were to be suspended.[49]

---

[47] Protest No. 3 was signed by Doehler and took the same position on the anti-Christ as No. 1. It also declared that the statement about sin, if doctrines were unjustifiably made doctrines of faith, was an attack on Missouri, unfair under American ecclesiastical conditions. A neutral stand was taken on several of the theses, but all chiliasm was rejected. Strobel signed No. 4 which declared that equal rights for the Neuendettelsau Richtung in the synod were incompatible with the confessional paragraph and must lead to continual controversy. Matter in protest No. 5 stated doubts about theses 4-8 on open questions and was not ready either to agree or to disagree. It may be noted here that Lutheraner XXXI, 17, 130, reported that Matter had retracted his protest against assertions of the Schmidt articles as published in the K. B. at the synod. Ibid., 22-3.

[48] Ibid., 23-4. The parting was undisturbed. The withdrawing pastors thanked the synod for love and friendship given them during their membership, stated that they would keep their brethren in affectionate and respected memory and asked to be remembered in the same spirit. Replies were made thanking them and pointing out that the synod must for conscience sake hold the differences non-church-separating. The amicable relationship was to become clouded, however, when two of the pastors subsequently published statements on their withdrawal with various inevitable accusations against the synod in the Lutheraner. Schieferdecker's statement which was also published as a pamphlet under the title, Mein Austritt

The convention found its time so completely taken up with these controversies, that little was left for other matters. The educational problems which had furnished the reason for its convocation could receive attention only late in the session. The action taken, particularly the decision to remove the college to Mendota, have been discussed elsewhere. When it was reported, however, that Lutz had left the convention and taken the Galena books along, apprehension arose that a plot existed to deprive the synod of the college property. Certain utterances of Klindworth were reported which indicated that he had at one time considered such a possibility and the situation made it seem not unlikely that a seceding faction might harbor such a plan. The synod thereupon suspended both Klindworth and Lutz.[50] The tenor of the discussion had made

---

aus der Synode von Iowa, appeared, XXXI, 15, 113-16; Matter's 17, 131-3. Strobel was to become involved in bitter controversy over withdrawal of his congregation at Wilton, which must be noted later.

[49] *Synodalbericht 1875*, 24.

[50] *Ibid.*, 29. Klindworth contended that the suspension was unjustified. In *Traurige Zustaende*, 8-34, he dealt with

it plain that the Schmidt articles, hitherto almost unanswered, had made a deep impression. The convention therefore ordered that a careful study of the documents used by Schmidt should be made and a reply published.[51]

---

charges against him under four heads, insubordination, improper conduct at Madison, agitation, and attempted theft of synodical property. Relevant to this point are particularly pp. 15-23 and 28-34. He again discussed the subject, *Zeugniss*, 14-40. It seems quite clear that he had no intention to seize the college at that time, although he admitted that he had once made such a suggestion. He also demonstrated that he had not left Madison at the time when the matter came up, but had been excused for illness and was not reached by a messenger sent to summon him, who seems to have found Lutz gone and to have accepted a statement that Klindworth had left too without investigation. In addition he demonstrated that the synodical report contained a number of inaccuracies which did not really have anything to do with the decision. *Bericht...Untersuchung*, 3-24, dealt with the contentions of *Traurige Zustaende*, admitting some of the minor points Klindworth made, and citing the utterance in regard to taking along the college, pp. 18-19. The suspension was voted at the end of long and bitter proceedings, during which Klindworth had taken a part which makes a suspicious attitude toward him understandable. It was this suspicion which brought about a suspension, which the facts did not really justify. Klindworth's bitterness, particularly over publication of untenable charges can readily be understood. In the last analysis, however, his own actions, which had certainly tended to cast suspicion on others, were responsible. The motion for suspension included the provision that he should be suspended until the reasons for suspicions against him should be disproved, but the synodical report did not indicate this.

[51] *Synodalbericht 1875*, 24. A committee was named to study the documents, to reject unjustified charges and point out such contradictions as might really exist. Apparently the two theological professors were the committee, for they were directed to submit their results to the Mendota Conference and then to publish them. The reply in *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, which was also authorized by this convention, will be noted later.

Though the convention of 1875 was turbulent, it refused to follow the lead of the groups responsible for the disturbance. Issues that had been agitated for some years and had created dangerous tension were brought out openly, debated with much heat and brought to a decision. A majority which remained passive throughout most of the session, listening rather than debating, finally rallied to synodical leadership, rejected all demands for radical changes and reasserted the historic position which had been clearly defined in 1860.[52] Over against Missouri's rigid position the synod reaffirmed its faithfulness to the symbols in respect to all doctrines of faith, as well as its refusal to abandon or to narrow its conception of non-church-separating differences in other respects. Over against Neuendettelsau the synod refused to commit itself as a synod to the specific doctrinal positions of that school, but gave assurances that those positions might be maintained and advocated in its midst on an equal basis with other viewpoints. The peculiar notion that misinterpretations of doctrinal statements by opponents proved the dishonesty of synodical leaders was rejected. The statement of the synodical position in the Madison theses may be regarded as definitive. Before long concurrence became a constitutional requirement for admission.

---

[52] K. B. XVIII, 12, 92-3, brings a brief report on the convention which refers to rumors which had reached Bauer that most Iowa pastors were ready to abandon the synodical position, to submit to Missouri on all points and that union with Missouri was already arranged. It then asserts that plots actually existed to destroy the synod and to surrender it to its enemies, but that they failed and that the old position had been fully sustained. This interpretation of events at Madison seems to have been generally held in the synod.

Maintenance of the synodical position, in the face of strong internal opposition, involved the probability of losses through withdrawal. The convention had faced this issue and had indicated that it preferred withdrawals to continued agitation. At the convention only three of fourteen members who had signed protests had withdrawn. Not only were there thus eleven pastors whose loyalty remained in doubt, but the group had other adherents who had not been present at Madison. Among these dissidents the idea of forming a separate organization with the backing of Neuendettelsau seems to have been considered. It was reported to synodical headquarters that some of them had held a meeting shortly after the convention at Prairie du Chien, which had decided that Klindworth should travel to Germany and to await results of his visit.[53] Klindworth indeed left for Germany not long afterward and visited Neuendettelsau.[54] This visit excited considerable perturbation in the synod and letters were promptly dispatched, describing Klindworth's recent activities, accusing him of insubordination, agitation, designs against the college property, and warning the German fathers against him.[55] At Neuendettelsau

---

[53] An incomplete letter, Luz - Deindoerfer, Dubuque, July 26, 1875, in I. S. D., reported this conjecturally. The writer thought that the synod's request, that the protesting pastors declare themselves, spoiled the plan and that most of the group preferred to join the Synodical Conference, having seen through Klindworth and turned against him. The letter reports various details about individual members of the group.

[54] Klindworth's purposes connected with this visit are not clear. It is difficult to see how he could have expected Neuendettelsau support for a group with strong Missouri tendencies. It is possible that he thought most of the group

---

young and easily led and that he hoped to hold them together in an organization which rejected chiliasm, but otherwise maintained a tolerant attitude in regard to divergent opinions on non-fundamental matters. A letter, Lutz - Klindworth, Galena, July 19, 1875, in I. S. D., written to Germany, indicates that the plans contemplated formation of a separate organization. Lutz wrote, however, that the group was too scattered and lacked an organ needed to hold them together. Though Kleinlein was trying to hold them in line, the probability was that most of them would end up "in der allein seligmachenden Kirche" and some were probably there already. Unless a favorable situation in Bavaria could attract a considerable number of old Iowans, Klindworth, Kleinlein and Lutz would probably standalone. It would seem therefore that Klindworth went to Germany in order to reach an agreement which would attract considerable numbers of old Iowans.

[55] A letter, Fuehr - --, June 13, 1875, in I. S. D., suggests that some one should be sent to Germany to follow Klindworth from place to place to expose him. He had already written to Germany revealing the machinations of the Galena clique. Another letter, Hertel - Prof. ?, Highland Centre, September 17, 1875, in I. S. D., reports that Neuendettelsau found the accusations of Fuehr and others difficult to believe and had asked for his impartial judgment. The writer did not state what his reply was, but he indicated that he thought Klindworth dishonest and that his purpose in Germany was to secure instructions for the Neuendettelsau men in America to make common cause with himself. The already cited letter from Luz, July 26, 1875, took the situation rather lightly. Klindworth could not succeed, what the German fathers disliked in the synod they would dislike more strongly in Klindworth. Replies from Germany to be cited subsequently indicate the character of the accusations against Klindworth made in letters from pastors and synodical officers. A copy of a letter, Deindoerfer - Deinzer, Defiance, June 16, 1875, in I. S. D., contains apparently typical accusations. Klindworth was reported to intend to leave for Germany at once, before countermeasures could be taken and was trying to keep the voyage secret. His purpose was to agitate against the synod in all the German centers whence it drew support and to cast suspicion on synodical officers and the synod. The writer then detailed Klindworth's agitation in 1874 and since, his conduct in regard

Klindworth was confronted with these charges. He made a defense which produced a good impression. Deinzer particularly came to think that excited feelings in America had exaggerated his faults. The Gesellschaft could not find an essential difference between his position and that of the synod. Since, however, there was no disposition toward breaking with the Iowa Synod at Neuendettelsau, there was never a question of throwing support behind Klindworth in its stead. He was advised to make his peace with the synod and similar advice was sent to America.[56]

---

to the college before, during, and after the convention and expressed the fear that he was trying to take it from the synod, because title stood in his name. He was charged with organizing the opposition proceedings at Madison and with conducting them in such a way that it was difficult for the defense to obtain the floor. The judgment was expressed that Klindworth intended to overthrow the existing synodical government and obtain control for himself. Lest a bare summary create a misleading effect, it should be added that Deindoerfer wrote judiciously and without passion.

[56] Deinzer had taken Bauer's place at the Missionsanstalt. There are references to Klindworth in all of his letters of this period and it is obvious that he thought the charges exaggerated. Even when Traurige Zustaende appeared later, though disapproving entirely, Deinzer felt that Klindworth had been provoked into writing it. In an already cited letter to G.. Fritschel of August 24, 1875, he wrote that he at once confronted Klindworth with charges from letters which had preceded his arrival. Klindworth regretted the refusal to admit the visitation committee and Lutz' departure with the books, as well as his own original treatment of the Galena committee, but denied all intentions of seizing the college property and stated that he had left power of attorney behind to surrender it. Deinzer did not think Klindworth fully vindicated, but felt that the case was much less black than presented. On the position of the synod he was surprised to find so little difference and he was little disturbed over continued assertions that a change had taken place. Neuendettelsau, as will be noted later, considered this a technical point. On the whole he also approved of Klindworth's purposes as they were stated to him, see footnote 18. Klindworth denied charges of agitation

While Klindworth was failing to obtain German support, a number of other dissidents held a free conference at Earlville to discuss their future course.[57] After his return another free conference was announced for Wilton, to which both pastors of the synod who had already withdrawn, and others who had not but entertained doubts, were invited.[58] This

---

and admitted collaboration with the Missouri faction, but only to the point of obtaining an admission of change of position. In Germany he made no attempt to agitate or collect funds either in Bavaria or elsewhere, nor did he visit Melsungen and Mecklenburg. Deinzer at parting advised him to make his peace with the synod. Similar statements appear in Deinzer's reply to Deindoerfer's cited letter of August 26, 1875. Deinzer had then though obtained a copy of the synodical report and he feared that the attacks on Klindworth which it contained would make reconciliation impossible, but still hoped for peaceable parting. A letter, Wucherer - --, Aha, August 22, 1875, in I. S. D., probably to the Ausschuss, indicates that the writer had defended the synodical position against Klindworth, expressed the opinion that reconciliation should readily be possible and urged the synod to seek it. The writer remarks that Klindworth did not impress him at all, and he does not, like Deinzer, deal with the charges against him.

[57] This conference is mentioned in the already cited letters of Luz, July 26, 1875, who gives the date of the letter as the meeting date and, on basis of a reported statement from Westenberger, states the purpose as that of forming a conference and joining the Synodical Conference; and of Lutz, July 14, 1875, who informs Klindworth of it, and also gives the date of writing as the meeting date. Kleinlein had induced Matter to delay a statement of position until Klindworth's return, but Lutz did not think that this would avert the trend to Missouri.

[58] Lutheraner XXXI, 17, 133. The conference was called for September 15, 1875, and the notice was signed by Matter, Strobel, Vollmar, Westenberger and Dejung. In the preceding pages Matter had explained that regretfully they had found it necessary to leave Iowa for the sake of the truth, referring to alleged changes after 1859 which now had been denied at Madison, and taking the Missouri position on church, ministry, chiliasm and anti-Christ. These points were to be discussed.

session came to the conclusion that Iowa was not faithful to the symbols and recommended to pastors who had withdrawn that they join one of the synods of the Synodical Conference.[59] This course had already been taken by a number of pastors and was eventually taken by almost all the rest of those who withdrew from Iowa. As they did so, plans to form a separate organization came to nothing. The intention of doing so seems to have been seriously entertained only by the Galena group.

In the meantime the inquiries ordered by the convention had been made of pastors who signed the protests. Aside from the two suspended pastors all of them except Kleinlein withdrew within a short time and a number of additional withdrawals of pastors who held similar view followed, so that within a few months the synod lost twenty pastors.[60] The total loss was even larger, for a few pastors had withdrawn earlier and several others were expelled or withdrew a little later, so that the total loss over the years 1874-6 stood not far from thirty.[61] After joining synods of the Synodical Conference[62]

---

[59] Lutheraner XXXII, 3, 19. The conferences was discussed at length through 1, 2-4; 2, 12-14; 3, 18-19. It was not held until October, former Iowa pastors in attendance were Matter, Strobel, Schumacher, Schieferdecker, Zlomke, Vollmar and Sessler. Several laymen from Wilton and four Missouri pastors were also present, but no pastors still belonging to Iowa were listed. The declaration against Iowa contained seven points reminiscent of Matter's and Schieferdecker's protests and subsequent statements. Pastors not ready to join a synod as suggested were advised to attend conferences of their members. Matter added a statement which indicated that he was not ready to cast his lot with the Synodical Conference as yet.

[60] Besides Matter, Schieferdecker and Strobel, who had withdrawn at the convention, the list includes the following, Baumgaertner, Braeuer, Buehring, *Dejung, *Doehler, *Hirschmann, Kretzschmar, *Ledebur, Preller, Rehn, *Schulenburg, *Schumacher, *Sessler, Vogel, *Vollmar, *Westenberger, *Zlomke. For those whose names bear an asterisk there are letters of withdrawal in the I. S. D. Perhaps Vogel should not be included in this list, for he did not withdraw until the spring of 1876 and he

---

may not have been involved with the group, though doctrinal reasons were given. See letters, Luz - --, Dubuque, April 28, 1876, and E. Berg - Praeses, Charles City, April 3, 1876, in I. S. D. The withdrawal letters are generally brief and polite, only those of Doehler and Zlomke strike the cordial note of the oral withdrawals at Madison.

[61] Klindworth and Kleinlein were expelled. Dunsing and Hertrich had withdrawn to go to Missouri in 1874 and Nolte had asked for his release earlier in 1875, his withdrawal letter, Nolte - Grossmann, Stringtown, February 5, 1875, does not indicate doctrinal reasons, however. Deindoerfer in 1876 reported withdrawal of pastors Bode and Kraeling, not connecting them with recent events. Bode had, however, been in touch with Missouri according to a letter, Kroenke - Deindoerfer, Riga, February 12, 1876, in Deindoerfer Papers, though Deindoerfer's letters over a period of years had been critical of his conduct. Deindoerfer's report gave personal reasons for his withdrawal in 1876 and stated that Kraeling withdrew because he had violated the synod's policy in regard to secret societies, K. B.XIX, 19, 150. These withdrawals together with those of the preceding footnote total twenty-seven. It may be added that the relations of Pastor Brandstettner with the synod became precarious in 1876, though he was not finally considered as withdrawn until 1878, practice rather than doctrine being the reason, and that the positions of pastors Mehrtens and Oehlert were questioned; both of them withdrew subsequently, but the writer cannot state just when.

[62] Of those whose withdrawal was connected with the crisis, Buehring, Dejung, Kleinlein, Klindworth, Preller, Rehn, Vogel, Vollmar, Westenberger and Zlomke joined the Wisconsin synod. Baumgaertner, Braeuer, Doehler, Hirschmann, Kretzschmar, Ledebur, Schieferdecker, Schumacher, Sessler, Schulenburg and Strobel went to Missouri. See Der Lutherische Kalender, 1877-80, Matter remained independent for years but in 1893 had joined Ohio. Buehring, Vollmar and Klindworth subsequently went to Ohio also, Vollmar first having gone to Minnesota and Buehring later going to Buffalo. Zlomke left Wisconsin for Missouri and Westenberger and Rehn returned to Iowa, Ibid., in later years.

withdrawn pastors in some instances wrote articles in their organs justifying their action, or taking exception to general charges of ingratitude, which sometimes drew rejoinders.[63] Bitterness thus manifesting itself may in part have been due to requests made to some of the withdrawn pastors for repayment of costs of their education to the synod according to agreements signed by them, which in most cases were refused.[64]

---

[63] Two have been given in footnote 48. Doehler published a statement, detailing Iowa errors and even retracting his stand on usury in Lutheraner XXXI, 16, 121-2. A rejoinder to a statement on ingratitude signed X appeared XXXII, 8, 61-2, while 20, 158 refers to a rejoinder by Vollmar which it could not bring itself to publish, but referred readers to Wisconsin's Gemeindeblatt, which the writer has not seen. K. B. XIX, 23, 177-8 replied to Doehler, Y replied to X, 12, 91-2. A reply to Matter's statement was reprinted from Lutherische Zeitschrift, XVIII, 19, 146-8, while 18, 139-40, brought a statement on chiliasm.

[64] Pastor Zlomke alone in his withdrawal letter, Zlomke - S. Fritschel, Walnut, Iowa, August 9, 1875, in I. S. D., offered to repay as he could. S. Fritschel reported to the Western District in 1876 that such pledges existed, that he had not asked for repayments from pastors who had long been in service or who had been in the seminary only a short period and that considerate terms were offered to others. Some had not responded, others had written insultingly. Honorable dismissals had been denied to some for refusal or for unworthy reasons for withdrawal. A letter, Matter - S. Fritschel, Des Moines, November 12, 1875, in I. S. D., indicates that Matter, though not involved himself, (at least he claimed that loans without interest to the seminary had paid his account, it not being clear whether a demand was made on him) had advised others not to repay and had been called to account. He admitted that he had advised Dejung not to pay and to combine with others to resist suit if necessary. He also indicated that Zlomke, willing to repay voluntarily would resist a request as of right and that he would stiffen him in that attitude. Reasons were technicalities in the pledge, which was called invalid like a monastic vow. Men who had withdrawn for conscience sake owed no moral obligation. If the synod insisted on the pledge it would be obligated to repay offerings contributed by withdrawn congregations or pastors. The Western District endorsed the president's stand by passing a resolution that former students who had signed repayment pledges

In several cases the pastors took their congregations with them, the withdrawal letters stating no reason or stating it in terms which indicated that the parishes shared those of their pastors.[65] The policy followed was to grant honorable dismissals in such cases though the district subsequently resolved, that in cases where the doctrinal position of the synod was involved, it should be granted only if the congregation gave the synod an opportunity to present its case.[66] In

---

were in duty and conscience bound to repay unless relieved by the synod. It expressed surprise that men who charged the synod with dishonesty in theological controversy could so easily hurdle the demands of common honesty, K. B. XIX, 14, 107; president's report, 13, 97-100.

[65] Withdrawal letters for Caloma, Des Moines, Elkport and Polk City, Iowa, the latter three giving no reason, Fowler, Illinois, Freeborn County, Minnesota, Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin are in I. S. D. That for Freeborn County may have included withdrawal of the pastor (Kretzschmar) and stated simply that the conclusion had been reached that Iowa was wrong and Missouri right, but in this case the parish was not wholly lost as will be noted later. Galena also withdrew. In some cases congregations were not members of the synod and went with their pastors. A letter, Ledebur - Grossmann, Bath, Illinois, January 24, 1876, in I. S. D., gives such an instance. This may also have happened at Walnut, Iowa, and Meriden, Minnesota, and at Chattanooga, Tennessee, which are not listed as lost, but which the synod for a time at least did not serve subsequently, and possibly elsewhere. The president's report to the convention of the Western District in 1876 listed only four parishes with five congregations as lost, which would agree with the listing above, minus Freeborn County, but it can refer only to synodical congregations, and probably refers to honorable dismissals granted, K. B. 13, 97-100. Galena's withdrawal would be additional and was noted with a reprimand, 14, 108.

[66] K. B. XIX, 14, 108. This resolution has been discussed in an earlier chapter and notice has been taken of its modification in the constitutional revision of 1879. It was probably an outgrowth of indignation over the tactics of some of the withdrawing pastors. Whether such hearings had been asked by the president in all cases cannot be stated. A letter, Vorstand,

several cases attempts by the pastors to take congregations along were not successful, or there were opposition groups who protested the decisions. In cases of the latter kind the policy adopted was to grant the wishes of the majority, which sometimes led to schisms.[67] Of these, that at Wilton arose when Pastor Strobel, who had secured membership for the congregation in a rather irregular manner, attempted to with-

---

Prairie du Chien - Praeses, July 8, 1875, in I. S. D., refuses reconsideration and indicates that some attempt to secure it had been made in that case.

[67] This policy was stated by the president of the Western District, with the statement that opposed minorities were advised not to separate, as long as the congregation remained Lutheran, *K. B.* XIX, 13, 97-100. It was applied in the case of Des Moines. A letter to Iowa Ministerium, Des Moines, August 8, 1875, signed by ten members, in I. S. D., contains a request for a pastor and reports a schism. It is possible that other factors may have played a role in the refusal, for the letter asks for a good liberal pastor and seems to give some stress to property rights. However, a letter, Gass - S. Fritschel, Davenport, September 27, 1875, not only favors an attempt to hold Des Moines, but indicates that a strong claim for the minority in regard to property rights may have existed. A case in which a pastor tried to take a congregation along and failed occurred at Earlville, Iowa. Two opposed viewpoints on this affair are in *Lutheraner* XXXII, 10, 77-8 and *K. B.* XIX, 15, 116-7. A letter, Fuehr - S. Fritschel, St. Sebald, September 28, 1875, in I. S. D., mentioned that attempts were made by two of the withdrawn pastors to disturb that congregation where a pastor had remained loyal. A schism occurred in Freeborn County, see *Lutheraner*, XXXII, 16, 123-4; *K. B.* XIX, 22, 174-5, and a document entitled *Vom Hoerensagen luegt man gern* in I. S. D. Both Missouri and Iowa aired these clashes extensively and drew in others. The Missouri organ repeatedly referred to a schism that had arisen in Davenport, *e. g.*, *Lutheraner* XXXII, 4, 27-8. An Iowa writer drew in a controversy at Eau Claire, Wisconsin, with a Norwegian body in the Synodical Conference, *K. B.* XIX, 12, 91-2. There was little to choose between the tone, but the last Iowa contribution drew protests in letters, Hertel - Prof. ?, Nauvoo, June 25, 1876; Strassburger - Prof. ?, Cedarburg, June 26, 1876, in I. S. D. Thereafter these controversies died down.

draw it by similar means. When an investigation revealed that a majority wished to retain membership, Iowa recognized it and long-drawn-out litigation over property rights ensued, which finally came to a decision in Iowa's favor in the Supreme Court of Iowa.[68]

The cases of Klindworth and Lutz who had been suspended and of Kleinlein, who seems to have asked for time to consider his position, remained pending.[69] In regard to Kleinlein it was reported in 1876 that he had avoided several meetings in which he was to be given an opportunity to express himself and that he had continued to agitate. The district thereupon resolved to expel him. His congregation at Keokuk Junction withdrew as a result of this action.[70] Lutz had never been inclined to take the Missouri position. With the surrender of the college property the cause for his suspension was removed. He submitted a statement on his position to the Eastern District in 1876, which was found satisfactory in the main, but Grossmann desired a more explicit declaration on minor points. Lutz objected to the appointment of a committee which was to deal with him orally and refused to appear before it. In 1877 he presented both an apology for this failure and a satisfactory statement and was restored to good standing.[71] Lutz was an able man, his return to good standing secured for the synod a long lifetime of distinguished service. It may be added that Kroenke, who had not participated in agitation, nor been present at Madison, but was considered compromised in some quarters, particularly through Walther's account of the meeting with him and Schieferdecker, presented a statement on that point to the Eastern District in 1876 and remained a member in good standing.[72]

---

[68] The origin of the Wilton case is described K. B. XIX, 8, 60-62, while 14, 109-11, answers a Missouri reply in Lutheraner XXXII, 10, 75-77. Letters in I. S. D. referring to different phases of the case are Landdeck - S. Fritschel, Wilton, May 24, 1875; Gass - S. Fritschel, Davenport, May 31, 1875; Gass - --, Davenport, September 25, 1877, reporting victory in the lower court; Grossmann - G. Fritschel, September 6, 1879, concerning a request for help to pay appeal costs. Lutheraner XXXVI, 5, 38-9, comments on the final verdict as did XXXIII, 19, 150, on that in the lower court, an Iowa reply being in K. B. XX, 22, 172-4. I. S. D. also contains a statement on the status of the congregation signed by G. Fritschel, Mendota, November 12, 1876, and an arbitral award in favor of the minority, signed by Missouri and Wisconsin pastors, Watertown, November 9, 1878.

[69] Preller has been listed among those who withdrew in 1875. He does not seem to have withdrawn formally, however, but simply to have failed to make a reply to the inquiry directed to him. Some hopes of coming to an agreement with him seem to have existed, see letters, Fuehr - --, June 13, 1875, and Luz - --, June 21, 1875, in I. S. D., which differ radically in their judgments of him. The Western District in 1876 resolved to give him three weeks to make his reply and to consider him withdrawn, if he made none, while the president was empowered to act finally if he did, K. B. XIX, 14, 107. He was not mentioned in 1877.

---

[70] Ibid., for the expulsion, XX, 21, 162, for Keokuk Junction. The withdrawal technically came because of inability to agree on methods for an investigation, caused apparently by withdrawal from the congregation of a majority of members who favored Iowa, because of Kleinlein's tactics. A letter, Kleinlein - S. Fritschel, March 26, 1876, in I. S. D., indicates that Kleinlein asked for more time and refused a visitation. Kleinlein's agitation in part seems to have consisted in influencing a young assistant against synod, who soon came into full agreement with it, K. B. XIX, 15, 117-8. See also letters, Gass - S. Fritschel, Davenport, September 27, 1875; Luz - --, Dubuque, July 19, 1876, in I. S. D.

[71] The cited letter, Lutz - Klindworth, July 19, 1875, makes it clear that Lutz had no leanings toward Missouri. Bericht...Untersuchung, 17, indicates that his position in regard to the college property was soon regarded as cleared. Lutz seems for a time to have considered leaving the ministry entirely. The proceedings in regard to his reinstatement can be traced, K. B. XIX, 19, 160; XX 2, 9; 14, 105; 16, 122. Lutz seems to have raised objection in 1876 to proceedings beyond his statement, for it was reported that the motion by Grossmann to set up the committee to deal with him met opposition and was reconsidered after adoption and readopted.

If the impressions which were reported from Neuendettelsau were correct, Klindworth was not entirely averse to a reconciliation with his synod when he left there. While he was still in Germany, however, the synodical report on the convention of 1875 in which his conduct was sharply attacked made its appearance. He considered its tone provocative and

---

[72] Kroenke's correspondence with Bauer was also questioned. He was unwilling to make a statement, but pressure was put on him and he made it in writing to the Eastern District in 1876, K. B. XX, 2, 9. Kroenke's cited letter to Deindoerfer, November 28, 1875, discusses his correspondence with Bauer and indicates that his purpose was to bring about a reconciliation, while another, Kroenke - Deindoerfer, Riga, February 12, 1876, both in Deindoerfer Papers, deals with his contacts with Walther. Both also discuss his relationship to Klindworth. They make it quite clear that, while Kroenke wished to promote peace with Missouri and was critical of the synod in some respects, particularly financial administration, he was not disloyal and not hostile to existing leadership. The soundness of his judgment in his contacts with Walther is questionable, but the latter did not correctly understand and present Kroenke's attitude toward his own synod. Evidence on the pressure put on Kroenke is in letters, Deindoerfer - Grossmann, Defiance, February 10; March 14, 1876, in I. S. D. The cited letter, Luz - Deindoerfer, July 26, 1876, in I. S. D., expressed the belief that Kroenke would probably no longer be able to feel at home in the synod.

Neuendettelsau agreed with him on that point.[73] Considering the report inaccurate in various respects and himself unjustly attacked, he undertook to write a pamphlet in which he intended to defend himself and expose what he considered to be the basic weaknesses of the Iowa Synod. When the acting president inquired of him whether he had suggestions to make in regard to the disposition of his case, he replied merely that his pamphlet would soon appear and that it would say everything which he thought needed to be said at that time.[74]

---

[73] Most of Deinzer's letters of the period 1875-6 make references to this. Footnote 56 brought a citation which shows that Deinzer's immediate reaction to the report was fear that it would make reconciliation impossible. The citations there also indicate previous hopes for the reconciliation and the cited letters contain statements indicating that Klindworth was not wholly averse. The strongest statement on the report is in a letter, Deinzer - --, N. D., December 31, 1875, probably to Deindoerfer, in I. S. D. Deinzer felt that the affair should not have been published at all and that Klindworth could not do otherwise than reply. It is true that the report places Klindworth in the position of the chief architect of the Madison proceedings and creates an adverse impression against him. Klindworth was to charge that this effect had been achieved by deliberate falsifications. Footnote 50 cites his writings and the subsequent defense on these points. It may be said that while he demonstrated inaccuracies on relatively minor points, his charges cannot be said to be sustained. Klindworth took especial exception to the fact that the theological professors had written those portions of the report that dealt with the doctrinal controversy, Traurige Zustaende, 9-10. Bericht...Untersuchung, 2-3, indicates that the convention had instructed them to do so. The wisdom of this instruction may be questioned, for the men who had been under heavy personal attack were to write a presentation of proceedings directed against them. It was inevitable that their point of view would be presented, particularly when the synod had definitely endorsed it. It might have been wiser to have the presentation written by men who were not personally involved. It should, however, be pointed out that the synod had the intention of putting an end to agitation in its midst. Exposure of agitators was probably considered a test of their loyalty. If Klindworth was to remain in the synod, he was to admit his wrong implicitly at least, by accepting the reprimand implied in the presentation. Nor would he be likely to find a following again after public exposure.

The pamphlet appeared in November 1875. Klindworth first dealt with the charges against him which he found in the synodical report, rejected them decisively and made an attempt to present them as manifestations of partisanship intent upon the destruction of his good name. From personal defense he proceeded to an exposure of alleged basic maladies of the synod. One of these was the theology of its professors. Klindworth under this heading presented once more the contention of a change of position and laid the failure to acknowledge it to dishonesty. He also reviewed the relationship to the General Council and charged the Fritschels with deceit, fraud and treachery. The other evil was the administration of internal affairs, particularly of the educational institutions. Here the seminary administration was charged with waste, incompetence and machinations against the college. Throughout the pamphlets the two Fritschels and in particular S. Fritschel were strongly attacked. In the concluding section a number of alleged revelations derogatory to the character of the latter were made with the purpose of exposing this man, who was held undeniably to be chiefly responsible for the troubles of the synod and who was likely to ruin it utterly.[75]

---

[74] Bericht...Untersuchung, III. The suspicions that Klindworth intended to seize the college, expressed both in the report and in letters to Germany, were not justified, but were honestly entertained. Even when it became clear that Klindworth had taken steps to surrender the school, suspicion was entertained and reported to Germany that he had done so only because he had found that he could do nothing else. It can be understood that Klindworth resented such suspicions as slurs upon his personal integrity, but it also seems clear that his course had furnished grounds for a suspicious attitude toward him.

Although Klindworth's pamphlet bore unmistakable traces of personal animus it was printed in the synodical printery of the Missouri Synod and the organ of that synod pointed out its basic features in a review and recommended it.[76] The synod later charged Missouri with attempts to spread it quickly and widely through Iowa congregations, and Missouri adherents in Germany attempted also to do this in Bavaria.[77] It was obvious that the pamphlet could not remain unanswered, particularly not if it should become generally known throughout the congregations. The theological professors therefore immediately asked the acting president for an investigation of the charges against them.[78] The *Ausschuss*, which had intended in a December session to take up the Klindworth case, then resolved to suspend all dealings with him and to refer the case to the next district convention. In regard to the investigation, a committee consisting of all synodical officers, including conference presidents, was named to conduct it.[79] This method of procedure gave Klindworth no opportunity to suggest members and the committee in its subsequent hearings, did not summon Klindworth to testify. It took up the charges in his pamphlet one by one and gave the theological professors opportunity to answer them and to present evidence from other sources. Committee members also testified and presented documents.[80] Within the limits of this procedure the charges were thoroughly investigated and the committee arrived at a unanimous verdict of not guilty.[81] Although opponents of the synod pronounced it a whitewashing report, the subsequent publication of the proceedings was accepted as substantiating the verdict in the synod and among its friends and whatever unrest the Klindworth pamphlet had caused, was soon completely allayed.[82]

---

[75] Klindworth, Traurige Zustaende. The last two clauses of the final sentence are a paraphrase of statements on p. 79. The charges in regard to the General Council are on p. 54.

[76] See imprint on the pamphlet. The review appeared immediately on publication, Lutheraner, XXXI, 22, 175.

[77] Chronik, 125, states that Missouri sources spread the pamphlet throughout the synod, before synodical officials were aware of its publication. The president's report to the Western District in 1876 stated that Missouri printed the pamphlet, advertised it, even in the secular press, offered it as subscription premium, distributed it in its own and Iowa's congregations and in Germany and paid no attention to requests to advertise Iowa's reply. The author has seen no denial of these charges in Missouri publications, even though the district included all of them except that relating to premiums in a reprimanding resolution which was to be sent to all Missouri district presidents, K. B. XIX, 13, 99-100; 14, 107. The Missouri Synod was responsible for the publication, undoubtedly distribution was through individual effort, but the synod gave no sign of disapproval. A letter, Deinzer - --, N. D., February 1, 1876, refers to attempts to spread the pamphlet or its contents in Bavaria. The letter is in I. S. D.

---

[78] The exact publication date cannot be determined. The inquiry to Klindworth by the president was dated November 2. The date of his reply which indicated that the pamphlet would soon appear is not known, but must have come some days later. The *Lutheraner* issue, recommending it was dated November 15. The investigation was requested November 28, *Chronik*, 125. The request for an investigation appeared *K*. *B*. XVIII, 23, 182.

[79] *Chronik*, 125-6; 129. The members signing the report were Grossmann, Deindoerfer, List, synodical officers, Foelsch, Luz, Wittig, from synodical committees, Bredow, Schmidt, Koeberle, Ide, conference chairmen, and Michaelsen, who does not seem to have held an office at the time, though he may have assisted with the treasury. The Ohio, Galena, Wisconsin, Southern Illinois-Missouri and Nebraska Conferences were not represented, the writer cannot state why not. Deindoerfer may have been chairman in Ohio and Klindworth at Galena, possibly the others could not come, particularly since notice was very sudden, the investigation being held in the first week in December.

---

[80] The acting president stated that he had chosen all synodical officers, in order to avoid charges of partiality in selection, Bericht...Untersuchung, III. The investigation was not considered as involving Klindworth, whose case had been referred to the district, but as relating to the theological professors who stood gravely accused and had requested it, K. B. XIX, 4, 29-30. Several of the members were related to the professors by marriage and many of them were synodical officers who were to some degree implicated in various affairs attacked by Klindworth. Foelsch and Bredow had been members of the Galena group and attempts had been made to draw Luz into it. All of them had, however, long since broken with Klindworth and their testimony against his accusations was important in many instances. It can be understood therefore that Klindworth regarded the committee as biassed. Missouri was to take the same line, Lutheraner XXXII, 2, 14; 6, 46. But Neuendettelsau also questioned the wisdom of the procedure, see the cited letter from Deinzer of February 1, 1876.

[81] The verdict was published and a report promised, K. B. XVIII, 24, 188. The report did not appear until March.

[82] The whitewashing statement appeared, Lutheraner XXXII, 2, 14. The report was published as Bericht...Untersuchung which has often been cited. There is little evidence of strong perturbation in the synod over Klindworth's pamphlet, except for widespread indignation. Chronik, 125, states that the accused were too well known in the synod to be greatly harmed and, p. 126, it remarks that danger threatened in some congregations was averted by the investigation report. A letter, Bredow - Prof. ?, Maxfield, January 22; February 29, 1876, indicates that the Maxfield congregation was originally perturbed and that outside efforts were made to increase the disturbance, but that difficulties died down after the verdict

Klindworth replied to the investigation report with a second pamphlet, which strongly assailed its impartiality. He did not, however, meet its presentations point by point, but after reasserting charges that the synodical report of 1875 had been falsified, contented himself with contesting a number of points and left much of the presentation unanswered. This procedure by implication at least admitted that he could not uphold some of his original charges and since much of what was contested in the investigation report was hardly met convincingly, the effect in the synod at least seems to have been a strengthening rather than a weakening of confidence in the

---

had been published. An instance of agitation by an individual Missouri zealot is related in a letter, Gerlach - S. Fritschel, Waverly, August 13, 1875, but it occurred before the pamphlet was published. These and other letters in the I. S. D. which need not be individually cited, indicate that such pastors as took the trouble to write, accepted the verdict without question. Certainly there was no new outbreak of withdrawals of either pastors or congregations. In Germany no great harm was done either. A letter, Deinzer - Grossmann, N. D., June 22, 1876, indicates that the pamphlet got into one congregation and stirred up feeling, but that the K. B. verdict of not guilty was available to allay it. Deinzer assured Grossmann that the charges against the Fritschels had never been taken seriously in Gesellschaft circles, but both this letter and others indicate that they did place credence in those regarding financial maladministration. He urged the synod to be careful in this respect, a request seconded in a letter, Wucherer - --, Aha, June 2, 1876. Letters, Vilmar - S. Fritschel, Melsungen, June 17, 1876, and Chrestien - S. Fritschel, Buetzow, December 13, 1875, assure the synod of unbroken confidence and support, though the latter notes that Lutheraner, widely read in that area, had caused some disturbance. All letters are in I. S. D.

committee and its work.[83] In the meantime the Western District had created a committee to deal with Klindworth and clothed it with the power to make a final disposition of his case. He was to be summoned and called to account for all his actions against the synod, including the pamphlet. If he should fail to appear, he was to be considered expelled.[84] Klindworth in reply denied the right of the district convention to take such action, rejected the committee as not impartially constituted, referred to his second pamphlet then in preparation and refused to have dealings with the synod prior to its appearance. He denied any intention of not submitting to investigation at all, but demanded a mixed tribunal, containing members of other synods for his hearing.[85] The synod accepted this as a refusal to appear as requested, took no further steps and considered Klindworth as expelled.[86] The district synod had also resolved to accept the verdict of the investigating committee and had passed a resolution expressing full confidence in its theological professors, which was subsequently also adopted by the Eastern District.[87]

---

[83] This pamphlet, Zeugniss, has been cited repeatedly. Klindworth pointed out that various members of the committee were themselves involved in his charges and in fact made a strong case against its sitting in judgment on him. However, the committee had not done that, it had not considered his case at all. Clearly the final disposition of his case would be affected by its rejection of his charges, but through his method of bringing his charges publicly and through a hostile agency, he had himself made this result inevitable. He did demonstrate that there were inaccuracies in the synodical report, but these were not of vital significance. The effect of unconvincing replies to some of the presentations of the committee, and of none at all to others, was that the charges of the original pamphlet lost and that the refutation gained credibility.

[84] The committee consisted of three pastors (Grossmann, Beckel, Fuehr) and two laymen and all congregations had the right to have a representative present. The committee was authorized to establish its own mode of procedure and directed to keep exact minutes and to submit them to the district. It might appoint any pastor of its choice to act as secretary. Its power of decision, included the right to expel. K. B. XIX, 13, 100, Chronik, 132.

The struggle in the convention of 1875 and the resultant reassertion of the synodical position thus had an aftermath of withdrawal and disturbance. The synod suffered heavy losses, but they were not serious enough to cripple its activities. Klindworth's pamphlet represented an attempt to maintain the Madison charges and an appeal to the rank and file of the membership to repudiate the synodical leadership. The attempts to make it widely known among the lay membership created a good deal of apprehension. Much personal suffering was inflicted on the men who were the objects of its attacks and some degree of humiliation on the synod as a whole. Beyond such inevitable results, it seems mainly to have aroused indignation and to have caused the synod to rally to its leaders, rather than to desert them, to maintain its position, rather than to question it. Klindworth's action also made inevitable his elimination from synodical membership. While he was an able man, who had given much loyal service to synodical causes, and while it may be that even in his writings he was moved by a perverted sense of duty, it is clear that he had gradually developed an attitude or, more accurately, a state of mind which would have rendered harmonious cooperation impossible, even if he had not published his charges and if a reconciliation could have been effected.

---

[85] A copy of Klindworth's letter of refusal, Klindworth - Bredow, Galena, June 23, 1876, is in I. S. D. He objected particularly to Grossmann as a member or chairman. He seems to have taken the attitude that through rejection of his pamphlet he had been judged and excluded from the synod. See his letter to Duerschner, Galena, March 11, 1876. In effect his attitude seems to have been that through his allegation of grave charges against synodical leaders, the synod had been rendered incompetent to judge his case and that it must be brought before an intersynodical tribunal especially constituted to hear it.

[86] K. B. XIX, 13, 104, published a notice of Klindworth's refusal and directed the committee not to meet. The meeting date had been set at the district convention.

[87] Ibid., 100, 14, 108; XX, 2, 9. The resolution is also in Chronik, 134-5. Action was unanimous.

Synodical leadership and membership both suspected that the entire crisis had arisen as a result of a conspiracy between dissentients in its own midst and the leadership of the Missouri Synod for the purpose of either wrecking the Iowa Synod or bringing it into the Missouri camp. The suspicion was based on Walther's meeting with Schieferdecker and Kroenke, on the activities of the Missouri faction and on the character and timing of the Schmidt articles.[88] After the synod had reasserted its position Missouri gave some degree of substance to beliefs that it had entertained hopes for such developments. Not only did it receive many of the pastors who withdrew and open its organ to presentations hostile to the synod by them, but a new series of Schmidt articles appeared, reasserting the former charges more strongly than ever.[89] Missouri also printed Klindworth's first pamphlet and denounced the investigation of its charges. Its organ for many months ran bitter attacks, bristling with hostility, and it went so far as to request that Iowans cease calling Missourians brethren.[90]

---

[88] The writer is not convinced that an actual conspiracy existed. The Missouri faction and Klindworth's group did not agree entirely on doctrinal points. Schieferdecker seems honestly to have been seeking agreement and Matter never went to Missouri. That Missouri was trying to attain the ends sought and encouraging dissidence, however, seems established. Walther did meet Schieferdecker and Kroenke and his letter to

---

Sieker makes it clear that he was aware of the ferment in the synod. In *Lutheraner* XXXI, 5, 45, a notice was published which dealt with the psychological riddle, why honest Christians in the Iowa Synod who had read the articles unmasking the dishonesty of their leaders, remained silent and did not demand public repentance. Schmidt a little later admitted a deliberate appeal in his earlier articles to the Iowa membership, 19, 145-7.

[89] It appeared under the title, *Die Weigerung der Iowasynode ihre fruehre Lehrstellung zu widerrufen*, *Lutheraner* XXXI, 19, 194-7; 20, 153-5; 21, 161-5; 22, 170-2. The statements of withdrawn pastors and presentations on congregations have already been cited. It may be noted that the tone of the former was moderate, while the latter usually dropped all restraints.

[90] *Lutheraner* XXXI, 15, 119. The *Kirchenblatt* had commented on Missouri's relationship to Hermannsburg. The reply called the Iowa statements deliberate lies and added the statement to which the text refers. It may be added that refusal of prayer fellowship on the part of the Synodical Conference to non-members received mention *K. B.* XX, 24, 189; XXI, 17, 133. Attention should also be called to Allwardt's report on the convention of 1875 already cited and to an attack XXXII, 16, 124. For about a year this organ contained hostile comments, or reports of some kind, in almost every issue. In XXXII, 10, 75, it announced that it would no longer deal with the Iowa leadership. It was to be shunned. It would, however, bring

In consequence of such tactics controversy between the two synods flared violently for a time. Although the *Kirchenblatt* in 1875 brought mainly general statements on the crisis and the resulting developments, it attacked Missouri indirectly through sharp comments on controversies in which that synod was involved. After the Klindworth pamphlet had been published the bars were let down. Not only were official statements and announcements bearing on the whole situation published, as well as testimonials supporting the synod in its position, but sharp replies were made to statements appearing in the Missouri organ and in a tone that left little to choose between the two.[91] The chief defensive effort was, however, devoted to a thorough study of the Schmidt articles and to an elaborate answer which was published in *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* in 1876 and 1877. This series of articles made a thorough study of the documents which Schmidt had cited and on basis of them not only repudiated his charges, but charged him with

---

articles in which individuals defended themselves against attacks, two of which appeared immediately. Thereafter, however, little more appeared and the *Lutheraner* in the main followed a policy of ignoring Iowa.

[91] Deindoerfer published a long statement, reviewing the entire crisis and implying the conspiracy theory in *K*. *B*. XIX, 2, 9-12. A testimonial from Pastor Schmidt, who indicated that he still held chiliast beliefs, appeared 7, 50-1. See also 3, 20-21; 4, 31; 5, 34-5; 6, 46-48, which occasioned replies in the *Lutheraner*, since it attacked ingratitude of withdrawn pastors, and 9, 67-8; 15, 117-8. In several instances editorial introductions justified contributions on basis of self-defense. Replies to controversial presentations in the Missouri organs have been cited elsewhere, it was chiefly they which assumed a sarcastic or hostile tone. Notice has already been taken of protests against this tone which eventually came in. By the middle of 1876 this flurry of controversy had spent itself and thereafter the *K*. *B*. too largely ignored Missouri.

In consequence of such tactics controversy between the two synods flared violently for a time. Although the Kirchenblatt in 1875 brought mainly general statements on the crisis and the resulting developments, it attacked Missouri indirectly through sharp comments on controversies in which that synod was involved. After the Klindworth pamphlet had been published the bars were let down. Not only were official statements and announcements bearing on the whole situation published, as well as testimonials supporting the synod in its position, but sharp replies were made to statements appearing in the Missouri organ and in a tone that left little to choose between the two.[91] The chief defensive effort was, however, devoted to a thorough study of the Schmidt articles and to an elaborate answer which was published in Kirchliche Zeitschrift in 1876 and 1877. This series of articles made a thorough study of the documents which Schmidt had cited and on basis of them not only repudiated his charges, but charged him with

---

articles in which individuals defended themselves against attacks, two of which appeared immediately. Thereafter, however, little more appeared and the Lutheraner in the main followed a policy of ignoring Iowa.

[91] Deindoerfer published a long statement, reviewing the entire crisis and implying the conspiracy theory in K. B. XIX, 2, 9-12. A testimonial from Pastor Schmidt, who indicated that he still held chiliast beliefs, appeared 7, 50-1. See also 3, 20-21; 4, 31; 5, 34-5; 6, 46-48, which occasioned replies in the Lutheraner, since it attacked ingratitude of withdrawn pastors, and 9, 67-8; 15, 117-8. In several instances editorial introductions justified contributions on basis of self-defense. Replies to controversial presentations in the Missouri organs have been cited elsewhere, it was chiefly they which assumed a sarcastic or hostile tone. Notice has already been taken of protests against this tone which eventually came in. By the middle of 1876 this flurry of controversy had spent itself and thereafter the K. B. too largely ignored Missouri.

deliberate misrepresentation and distortion. It came to the conclusion that the basic difference between the synods in regard to doctrine was the contention, whether such doctrines as those on the ministry, the anti-Christ, etc., were doctrines of faith and church-separating, but that the real cause of inability to reach an agreement was inveterate hostility of Missouri over against the Iowa leadership.[92] Missouri made only feeble replies to this refutation.[93]

---

[92] K. Z. I, 1, 7-34; 2, 49-66; 3, 72-98; 4, 105-26; 5, 139-54; 6, 167-84; II, 1, 13-32; 2, 42-64; 3, 69-96; 4, 104-25. It was also separately issued in a pamphlet which the writer has not seen. The last installment, pp. 112-25, deals with the basic causes of the controversy.

[93] Schmidt made a reply to the first installment, Lutheraner XXXII, 6, 44-45, characterizing it as a "sophistisches Truggewebe," refusing to go into detail, and questioning certain documents, which he could hardly regard as official. A reply appeared, K. B. XIX, 7, 51-3; 8, 59-60, which demolished his arguments. Missouri waited a year after the full series had been published and then remarked that Iowa had waited a year after the publication of the original charges, to let their impression pass before it published a reply written with the species of acuteness which knew how to make black appear white. Lehre und Wehre XXIV, 10, 313. K. Z. replied III, 5, 156-60, pointing out that the Iowa reply began appearing shortly after Schmidt's last article and that his pamphlet, containing all the articles, appeared during the publication of the Iowa series and that, therefore, Missouri itself had let the impression of the rejoinder pass, before it commented. It also pointed out that Missouri was still claiming that the Schmidt articles were irrefutable, but that it made no attempt to disprove the refutation in the K. Z. Schmidt himself, published only a brief statement still later, in which he complained of personal attacks, admitted that he had not possessed adequate documentary material and used notes rather than documents in some cases, but maintained that his position was unchanged, Lehre und Wehre, XXV, 2, 52-3. K. Z. IV, 2, 43-50, pointed out that since Schmidt had pretended to write on basis of documents his admission was utterly damning.

For the rest of the period the two synods avoided the extremes of controversy of the years 1874-1876. Occasional interchanges still occurred in the church papers, but Missouri followed a policy of ignoring Iowa's position, rather than of concentrating heavy attacks upon it and making them in a popular organ. Iowa confined itself to replying to occasional criticism. In their theological magazines, both synods defended their viewpoints upon the controversial questions, but aside from the reply to the Schmidt articles, they usually presented them objectively and with little reference to each other. Both fully maintained their positions and there was no indication of an approach toward an understanding. The relationship therefore remained hostile. Toward the close of the period the predestination question was receiving renewed attention, foreshadowing another period of active controversy.

Restoration of the friendly relationship with Neuendettelsau was facilitated by the fact that both parties desired it. While Klindworth's visit in Bavaria disturbed the synodical leadership, it did not serve to intensify the estrangement, despite the fact that Deinzer, Bauer's successor, at least was disposed in his favor and that the Gesellschaft leadership urged a reconciliation.[94] The synod transmitted the

---

[94] Reference has already been made to the good impression which Klindworth made particularly on Deinzer. A letter, M. Loehe - S. Fritschel, Fuerth, June 20, 1876, in I. S. D., indicates that Deinzer was influenced by a desire to uphold Bauer. Since he had been close to the latter, he may have been predisposed in favor of Klindworth, because Bauer had placed trust in him.

Madison theses to Neuendettelsau immediately after the convention of 1875 and strongly indicated its desire to continue its cooperation with the Gesellschaft.[95] At a meeting of executives of that body in July 1875 a reply was drafted to the Madison theses. The Gesellschaft found that the synod had indeed changed position, but it found the change in the fact that the synod as a synod did not represent any particular Richtung, whereas it maintained that Iowa had originally represented the Neuendettelsau Richtung. It was, however, ready to accept the change, if its students received toleration in the sense that they were free to advocate their convictions on an equal basis. The *Gesellschaft* also accepted the assurance that the alteration of the confessional paragraph had not been intended to change the confessional position of the synod. It did not, however, like the change and argued that the older form and the former theory of confessional interpretation were sound, and that their abandonment had weakened the position of the synod by introducing an indefinite element which had sharpened controversy and would continue to do so. The declaration on specific doctrines was acceptable as a synodical point of view, but not as a series of limitations on toleration for dissenting viewpoints. On open questions the *Gesellschaft* adhered to the rejected view that they were questions not yet decided by common ecclesiastical consensus.[96]

---

[95] Synodalbericht 1875, 20, indicates that a covering letter was also approved by the convention. The writer has not seen this. However, Deindoerfer's long letter to Deinzer, June 16, 1875, discussed the entire situation. It noted that the synod had not changed the confessional paragraph back to its earlier formulation, because it had not made a change in its position through the alteration. The synod could not officially make the Neuendettelsau Richtung its own, but it did give it equal rights with any other and since it was largely held by the theological professors, it actually occupied a position of influence. (It should be noted here that when the word "toleration" is used in this presentation in relation to Richtung, the meaning is that equal rights were granted. Neuendettelsau objected to a toleration which merely failed to condemn a position which was held to be wrong, but non-essential.) Deindoerfer also stressed the necessity of restoring mutual confidence and, after admitting that the synod had been remiss in sending information to Germany, contended that the German fathers too had been remiss in not taking up their grievances directly with synodical leaders. Mistrust once established would poison the relationship, it must be eradicated totally.

---

[96] *Protokoll der in Aha am 14, Juli abgehaltenen Conferenz des Ausschusses von Abth. I d. Ges. F. i. M.*, in I. S. D. The point on the open questions was discussed at some length, it maintained that the position taken gave a satisfactory answer to the question, why are open questions non-church-separating, more so than contentions that doctrines not clearly revealed in Scriptures, or that doctrines of non-fundamental character were concerned. The reply made it clear that the *Gesellschaft* thought that Iowa had gone too far in its efforts to reach an understanding with Missouri. It had not succeeded, because it had substituted indefinite for definite formulations, without changing its position. Opponents would simply charge Iowa with dishonesty, which, of course, was just what had happened. It may be noted that the reply also put in a plea for reconciliation with Klindworth. Attention should also be called to the fact that the change in *Richtung* which the *Gesellschaft* asserted, had undeniably taken place in the first few years and had been admitted at Madison. The Madison opposition had asserted much more than this.

This reply was sent to America together with covering letters. Taken together they indicated that the Gesellschaft did not altogether approve of the position of the synod, but that it believed that cooperation could be continued.[97] Since the reply called for synodical assurances on several points, the Ausschuss in December 1875 drafted an answer, which asserted that the Neuendettelsau impression of a change of Richtung rested upon a misconception of what the synodical Richtung had been. The synod as such had always intended to grant equal rights to representatives of various viewpoints in its midst. The new confessional formula was defended and the position on open questions maintained.[98] The *Ausschuss* of the *Gesellschaft* drafted another reply in 1876 the exact nature of which cannot be ascertained. The difference in regard to open questions was still maintained, but assurance of cooperation seems to have been given.[99]

---

[97] A friendly letter, Wucherer - Ausschuss, Aha, August 22, 1875, in I. S. D., expresses the opinion that while Klindworth could assert the change in Richtung discussed in the preceding footnote, the writer could agree that the change was purely formal and that in substance the synod was still pursuing the objectives of 1854. It asserted, however, that to change expressions for the sake of agreement with Missouri was vain and that it was wiser to take a stand and adhere to it. Another letter, Deinzer - G. Fritschel, August 24, 1876, observed that this was Wucherer's personal opinion, not shared entirely by others. Deinzer thought that a real change had occurred which he deplored, because it might lead to indifferentism. He would have preferred maintenance of the Neuendettelsau Richtung by the synod, but conceded that to do so was now impossible and with the necessary assurances the position of the synod would make cooperation possible. In a second letter, Deinzer - Deindoerfer, August 26, 1876, both in I. S.D., he denied that Bauer had demanded a return to synodical advocacy of the Neuendettelsau Richtung, or that the Gesellschaft had ever intended that its doctrinal positions should become synodical doctrines. He would have liked maintenance of the former advocacy through unanimous consent. The Madison theses, however, guaranteed the necessary minimum of latitude for cooperation. Both letters agreed that restoration of mutual confidence was essential and asked synodical leaders to cooperate in this respect.

Iowa's *Ausschuss* a year later considered another reply, but resolved instead to send an urgent invitation to the *Gesellschaft* to delegate one of its members to attend the anniversary convention in 1879. The differences might then be discussed orally with better prospects for reaching full agreement.[100] After some delay the Gesellschaft agreed to this suggestion and Deinzer was delegated to visit America.[101] In the meantime echoes of the differences continued to cloud the relationship somewhat, though cooperation was maintained.[102] When Deinzer arrived the differences were thoroughly discussed. Deinzer came to the conclusion that the Richtung had not been changed, Neuendettelsau had paid too much attention to the synodical report of 1858 and not enough to later statements, and had missed the development of the Richtung. The synod had also not changed position with the alteration of the confessional paragraph. Though he still did not like the change, he could accept it. The open question theory was also acceptable, if the qualification were added that after ecclesiastical consensus had been obtained, such questions might cease to be open.[103] Deinzer declared himself fully satisfied with these results and thus harmony at last was fully restored.

---

[98] No copy of the reply is extant. I. S. D. contains *Copie des Briefes an H. Pf. Wucherer-Antwort auf das Prot. v Aha* but for the relevant portions reference is made to the minutes of the *Ausschuss* session, which are also not extant. *Chronik*, 128-9, gives some indication of the contents of the reply and states that the *Ausschuss* was not clear as to the meaning of the Aha references to the declarations of the Madison theses on specific doctrines. An undated copy or draft of a letter, Deindoerfer - Deinzer, shows how the *Richtung* of the synod was gradually and consistently developed, admits that the synod made more concessions to Missouri than the writer liked, but asserts that no change in fundamental position had taken place. The synod did grant equal rights to the Neuendettelsau viewpoints, but it could not make them conditions of membership.

[99] Another friendly letter, Wucherer - Grossmann, Aha, June 2, 1876, in I. S. D., refers to open questions as an open question between the two organizations. The writer had not participated in the deliberations which produced the reply which he transmitted, but he professed essential agreement with it and hoped that it would prove acceptable and promote harmonious cooperation. A reference to communications would seem to indicate that the reply stressed regularity of official intercourse. A letter, Deinzer - Grossmann, N. D., June 22, 1876, in I. S. D. somewhat grudgingly accepts the Iowa conception of its *Richtung*, still regrets the alteration of the confessional paragraph but accepts assurances that no change of position was attended, again somewhat grudgingly, and emphasizes that advocates of Neuendettelsau viewpoints must have full rights and not receive bare toleration. See also *K. M., N. F.*, VIII, 5, 34-5. The official minutes to which the letters refer were not found in the I. S. D.

---

[100] Drafts of letters to the Neuendettelsau Ausschuss and to Wucherer from Grossmann in I. S. D. contain the invitation. The former indicates that a reply had been discussed to the point of formulation, but that Grossmann had suggested that understanding would be difficult to reach by correspondence and that the synod could not conceive an anniversary in which the Gesellschaft did not participate. The second regrets that Wucherer could probably not come for reasons of age, but suggests Deinzer. The drafts were dated, July 12, 1877.

[101] A letter, Deinzer - Deindoerfer, N. D., October 5, 1878, in I. S. D., indicates that no decision had yet been reached at that time and also that Deinzer himself was doubtful whether the invitation should be accepted. It may be noted that this letter was still somewhat critical of synodical vacillations in regard to doctrine, which were given as probable reasons for several recent withdrawals.

[102] Indications of Deinzer's dissatisfaction similar to that just cited occur in letters, Deinzer - --, August 8, 1877; Deinzer - Grossmann, April 24, 1878; Deinzer - S. Fritschel, June 26, 1878, in I. S. D. He thought that if the constitution were again taken up the confessional paragraph should be reconsidered, that Iowa could look forward to a good deal of trouble with Melsungen, and he wondered whether Iowa really desired Neuendettelsau men, having heard that it now had surplus manpower. He was greatly irked by criticism of German candidates by S. Fritschel, who had stated that they were poorly trained in preaching and in English and sometimes rather demanding, and who did not like a proposal that specific directions await them in New York. These criticisms indicate that irritation was mutual and the last letter indicates that personal relations between Deinzer and S. Fritschel were strained, because the latter blamed the former for statements published by Klindworth. During the American visit, however, Deinzer was a guest in S. Fritschel's home.

With the dissipation of the last clouds shadowing the relationship with Neuendettelsau, the last after-effects of the crisis of 1875 were overcome. That crisis had arisen, because the Richtung of the synod with its principle of toleration in regard to open questions made it possible for a faction to develop in its midst, which took advantage of its freedom to advocate its viewpoint to strive for control and substitution of its own position for that of the synod. The failure of Neuendettelsau to understand the true character of the Richtung created a confusion which enabled the Missouri faction and another influential group to make a determined effort to overthrow the synodical leadership. The firm stand taken by that leadership and cross purposes among the opponents defeated these efforts. The crisis led to numerous withdrawals and to a second attack on the leadership from the leader of the Galena faction. That attack too failed and resulted in the expulsion of its author. The losses did not really injure the synod. The elimination of dissentient elements served the purpose of promoting unity and restoring internal harmony. Rapid growth soon replaced the pastors who had withdrawn and enabled the synod to hold most of its parishes and to continue its expansion at a rapid rate. Though it took time to restore full harmony, cooperation with Neuendettelsau was never really broken at all and the graduates of that school entered the synod without a break. The position of the synod was preserved without change, and while individuals continued to withdraw from time to time, there was never again a revolt against it. Though the crisis meant a great deal of heart-ache for the leaders who were under attack and though the Klindworth attacks were resented as heaping disgrace and humiliation upon the synod, the final result was a wholesome cleansing. By 1879 the synod was a stronger and more cohesive body, more whole-heartedly united behind its Richtung.

---

[103] Deinzer's visit to America was described in series of travel reports in K. M. which were reprinted K. B. XXIII, 5, 36-8; 8, 61-2; 10, 77-8; 11, 86-7; 13, 102-3; 14, 118; 15, 114-5; 16, 125-7; 19, 150-1; 20, 158-9; 22, 173-4; 23, 182-3; 24, 187-9. The negotiations took place at Mendota and were described by him as the chief object of his visit. They are discussed in 15, 114-5; 16, 125-7. In addition to these conferences at Mendota and the convention at Maxfield, Deinzer visited various points in Iowa, including St. Sebald and Dubuque, and Madison and Watertown in Wisconsin. In the Eastern Conference he visited Defiance, Toledo, Detroit, Riga and the Michigan colonies. In the east he saw Krauth, Schmucker, Mann, and paid a visit to Passavant, who took him to his farm in the mountains. He spent some time in Philadelphia and New York and in the Pennsylvania Dutch region. Niagara Falls, Madison and Chicago aroused his admiration, he commented unfavorably on Iowa's mid-summer temperatures and was surprised, particularly in the Michigan colonies, at the contrast between American farmers and German peasants. At Strawberry Point, Iowa, he attended a Fourth of July celebration which impressed him and in New York he visited Coney Island. He was absent from Neuendettelsau for four months.

CHAPTER XX

SIGNIFICANCE: THE IOWA SYNOD AND AMERICAN LUTHERANISM

The Iowa Synod was the outgrowth of a conscious endeavor on the part of a German Lutheran group to influence the development of American Lutheranism. It is true that Loehe's missionary enterprises originally were inspired chiefly by the spiritual plight of unchurched emigrants. From the first, however, his emissaries were directed to make contacts with confessionally minded Lutheran synods. Nor was it long until Loehe began to plan his colonization policy. Through this policy he hoped to bring into existence compact Lutheran settlements, nuclei around which other Lutheran settlers might group themselves. Both, because it was difficult to furnish missionaries who could reach scattered Lutherans throughout the vast expanse of the United States, and because Lutherans mingled with non-Lutherans had a tendency to adopt other forms of Protestantism or at least to lose confessional consciousness, he hoped that strong Lutheran nuclei might prove attractive to newly arrived immigrants.

Within the colonial nuclei Loehe sought to develop a confessional Lutheran Church organized, mutatis mutandis, on the German model. Congregational constitutions written in Germany formed the basis of organization. Attempts were made to create endowed churches. Long tenures for pastors were encouraged. More important than these organizational features, which did not have far-reaching influence, was emphasis upon

Christian living. Here Loehe's own practices at Neuendettelsau formed the model. Frequent services and regular attendance were stressed. There was emphasis on Christian conduct in daily living, upon regular use of the sacraments, upon private communion and upon discipline. In the latter respect pastors were expected to admonish those who gave offense, and if necessary to apply the degrees of admonition. Beyond this, members of the congregations were expected to exercise brotherly discipline, warning, reproving and furnishing a good example. Stress was also placed on liturgical forms and on the beauty and dignity of the services. Finally Christian training of the youth in the home and particularly through parochial schools received strong emphasis.

Loehe's conception of an American Lutheran Church in the midwest thus thought in terms of compact and growing areas of Lutheran settlement devoted to the ideals of confessional faithfulness and sound practice, for which he himself was striving in his own parish. Although the colonies thrived and long maintained their distinctive features, they did not to a significant extent serve as nuclei of Lutheran settlement. The area chosen was not sufficiently attractive and in any case, diverse German elements could probably have been settled in compact groups only if a variety of such colonial enterprises had been launched in all parts of America.

When the Missouri Synod was organized, Loehe was ready to have his emissaries make common cause with several other widely scattered groups to form this body and direct his efforts toward giving it support. He hoped that this synod might be influenced through the pastors whom he had sent to represent the ideals for which he was striving. To a considerable degree it actually did so. It took a firmly confessional stand in opposition to general laxity then prevalent in America. It stood also for a practice in conformity with its professions and gave stress to most of the specific points on Loehe's program as it was developed in the colonies. During the controversy with Buffalo over church and ministry, it became clear to Loehe, however, that the Missouri leadership was given to a rigidity in its confessional views which he could not share. When Walther came to Germany, it became apparent that agreement on the controverted points could not be reached; and shortly afterward Missouri also made it clear that it had no intention of carrying the disagreement indefinitely.

The basic issue between Walther and Loehe was fidelity toward the symbols. Walther seemed to Loehe to stand for an attitude demanding very nearly absolute concurrence in all symbolical statements, as well as in doctrinal formulations which to Loehe were conclusions based on incidental symbolical statements and their theological exposition by the old Lutheran dogmaticians. Loehe himself was a university trained theological scholar, who believed in progressive theological development based on scriptural studies. He drew a distinction, therefore, between confessional content of the symbols and incidental doctrinal statements which they contained. The former represented the area of doctrinal controversy which had been brought to a conclusion. The latter belonged into a sphere in which there was still room for scriptural research and in which the church had the task of striving toward the attainment of a full understanding of divine truth. Symbolical fidelity required unconditional acceptance of everything that fell into the former area, but it left room for divergence of theological opinion in the latter.

Loehe seems to have hoped for a time that Walther might accept this point of view, and he undertook to secure its maintenance in the Missouri Synod. Through the teachers' seminary at Saginaw he hoped to provide a center for those elements in the Missouri Synod which adhered to it. Missouri was, however, successful in winning over all but a very few of Loehe's emissaries to Walther's point of view. Those pastors who continued to adhere to Loehe's point of view were subjected to strong pressure, with the result that they came to feel, not that their position was untenable, but that its maintenance within the Missouri Synod was impracticable. When Loehe consented to their withdrawal to Iowa, he accepted failure of his hopes to maintain his viewpoint within the Missouri Synod. Though that synod continued in the main to conform to his ideals in regard to practice, it had taken a rigid confessional attitude which he could not share. It, therefore, became desirable to foster a new center through which his attitude toward the symbols might be maintained in the Lutheran Church of America, lest it go from the extreme of confessional laxity to that of an orthodox rigidity, which would result in a dead traditionalism, maintaining that all doctrinal issues had been irrevocably settled in the sixteenth century.

The Iowa Synod thus represented an endeavor to make a new beginning, to build an ecclesiastical organization in which the various elements of Loehe's thinking could be put into practice and through which an influence might be exercised upon the Lutheran Church of America. Even the colonial plan was to be given a new trial; emigration was to be directed into a newly opened and as yet thinly populated region in Iowa where a strong and influential Lutheran center might arise. Lack of means prevented the realization of such plans. For them was substituted the endeavor to carry on missionary enterprise particularly on the frontier. Though plans for the employment of Reiseprediger could not be carried out effecttively until twenty-five years had passed, the synod always had a keen interest in such work and endeavored from early days to follow settlers into newly opened regions and to provide spiritual care before scattered Lutheran groups could become utterly unchurched or be drawn into other denominations. It may also be that the dispersal of the activities over a wide area was a perhaps unconscious substitution of the idea of exerting a broad influence over the entire northern region of the midwestern area, for the original intention of building up a compact and strong center of influence in Iowa.

In regard to practice the synod was so strongly influenced by Neuendettelsau ideals that through most of the first decade it followed a policy of selection, which militated against growth and development of numerical and material strength. Although a more moderate policy soon gained headway, the synod continued to emphasize the need of harmonizing practice and confessional professions. It sought to maintain standards of pastoral care which stressed the necessity of the manifestation of a Christian faith through Christian living. Discipline was no longer to mean the imposition of fixed standards of conduct; it was to take account of low levels of spirituality resulting from lack of ecclesiastical care; but it was still to be exercised for purposes of guidance. Insistence upon fixed liturgical forms regardless of varying backgrounds and deeply rooted usages or practices was not to be countenanced, but pastors were to strive toward creating an appreciation of liturgical dignity. Private confession was abandoned, but regular use of the sacrament was encouraged. Above all the synod continued to emphasize strongly, and at the cost of heavily burdening its clergy, the Christian education of its youth through religious instruction and stress upon parochial schools. While the visitation order underwent considerable change, the synod endeavored to maintain this institution in order to have a check on local conformity with its standards of practice.

Through the Richtungsparagraph of 1854 the synod adopted Loehe's ideas on fidelity toward the confessions. It accepted the quia in regard to the symbols, but it maintained that beyond them there lay an area where progress in doctrinal formulation on basis of scriptural studies might still be attained. The implications of this position were not clearly understood during the earliest years. For a time the membership of the synod was in unanimous agreement not only with Loehe's basic principle, but also with the specific positions which he personally and the school at Neuendettelsau maintained on a number of controversial doctrines. The appearance was thus created that the synod as a synod was pledged to advocacy of these positions, and this appearance was accepted as fact both in America and in Germany. As dissent arose in its own midst, the synod, however, drew a distinction between the synodical position and that of a majority of its members. The synod adhered to the basic principle; it declared divergent opinions on doctrines which were not doctrines of faith to be non-church-separating; but it took no synodical position on such controversial questions. On them it accorded full freedom of opinion to its membership, inclusive of the right of advocacy on an equal basis. This was the open question theory, which became the distinctive feature of its position toward the symbols.

Clearly, at the time of origin, the synod was dominated by the conception that its mission was faithful representation of Loehe's ideas. Its founders were prepared to launch a new colonial enterprise. A code of practice conforming strictly to Neuendettelsau ideals was rather inflexibly applied for some time. A statement of position was adopted which was taken verbatim from instructions given to German emissaries.

The members were ready to defend the Neuendettelsau theology in every detail. Equally clearly, this conception underwent considerable modification. The synod was confronted by American conditions; it faced practical realities and problems which made exact conformity with the ideals of an outside source extremely difficult. Thus the colonial plan had to be abandoned. It was an impracticable method of establishing a strong center of confessional Lutheranism representing a specific Richtung. The center was, however, established by other means. Practices were adapted to the realities existing among congregations consisting chiefly of individuals who had been unchurched for some time and whose level of spiritual understanding was low. But again the ideal of a practice encouraging a high standard of Christian living was maintained. The Richtung differentiated between maintenance of open questions and synodical positions upon them. Even here, however, with the exception of chiliasm, the Neuendettelsau interpretations remained dominant in the synod.

Neuendettelsau itself became confused for a time and charged the synod with having abandoned its position as originally defined. It is not surprising that this happened in view of the fact that Neuendettelsau itself did not have to make the differentiation between open questions and specific positions on them, but continued to advocate Loehe's specific viewpoints. Yet it is clear that the charge was essentially unjustified. The synod as an independent body, operating in an environment altogether different from that of Germany, did indeed develop its own Richtung and adapt its practices to American realities; but it remained faithful to the basic elements of Loehe's thinking. It did become a reasonably strong American center of confessional Lutheranism, maintaining the conception of open questions and emphasizing a practice conforming both to confessional fidelity and to exalted standards of Christian living. It did not, however, become a mere mouthpiece of a particular German school, adhering rigidly to its every pronunciation in the spirit with which modern political ideologies demand adherence to a party line.

In its contacts with American Lutheran Churches, the Iowa Synod manifested its fidelity to the purposes which Loehe had envisaged through consistent opposition to the General Synod. This body united a number of synods which had been established during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries when confessional consciousness was weak. Its membership had largely passed through the transition from German to English at a time when a Lutheran literature in the latter language hardly existed. It had in consequence made many contacts with Episcopalian and Calvinist Protestantism and had developed an ideal of an American Lutheranism, distinct from that of Europe, which was ready to sacrifice distinctive Lutheran traits and which manifested a strong trend toward unionist practice. In the fifties a number of prominent theologians in the General Synod produced the "Definite Platform," a revision of the Augsburg Confession, which omitted or altered doctrinal statements expressing a distinctive position over against Calvinism. The General Synod refused to accept this statement as its creed, as it had earlier opposed suggestions for outright union with Reformed Churches. It desired to remain Lutheran, but it frankly admitted that its conception of Lutheranism varied from the historic Lutheran ideal; it did not demand unconditional adherence even to the Augsburg Confession, and it leaned strongly toward fellowship with other forms of Protestantism.

It was this tendency in American Lutheranism which Loehe originally deplored. In opposition to it the Iowa Synod emphasized confessional fidelity, by requiring of pastors and congregations unconditional acceptance of all symbols and stressing a strictly non-unionist practice. The synod did not seek church fellowship with the General Synod and did not permit individual members to practice it. It did not during this period engage in direct doctrinal controversy with the older body or seek to influence it to change its position. The difference in languages hardly permitted such activities. Instead the synod devoted itself to the creation of a Lutheran Church in America faithful to the heritage of the Reformation. It considered itself part of such a church and it sought to gather unchurched Lutherans and immigrants recently arrived into its own midst and to inculcate in them confessional fidelity. Together with other confessional Lutheran bodies it strove to build up a strong conservatively Lutheran American Church in order to check the spread of confessional indifferentism and lax practice characteristic of the American Lutheranism of the General Synod.

In the task of building such a Lutheran Church in America the synod considered itself as taking part in a much broader movement, in which a number of other confessional groups, particularly Missouri and its associates in the Synodical Conference, had a share. The Iowa Synod consistently recognized Missouri as a staunch advocate of conservative Lutheranism. It gave full credit to its great adversary for devotion to confessional fidelity and sound practice. It had established church fellowship at one time with the synods which Missouri drew into the Synodical Conference and it consistently and strongly desired to do so with Missouri. From its point of view the common task over against the General Synod was harmonious cooperation between conservative Lutherans, and it went so far in the direction of seeking agreement with Missouri that it eventually suffered grave internal disturbances and jeopardized its relationship with Neuendettelsau. It would, however, not go the point of sacrificing its *Richtung*. It remained mindful of the fact that its own organization represented a protest against the extremes to which Missouri went in the reaction against American Lutheranism as understood by the General Synod.

As a conservative reaction gained headway in American Lutheranism, Loehe saw a new danger arising from Missouri's rigid attitude. If confessional fidelity was strained to the point of demanding complete unanimity in doctrine, if points of doctrine on which there always had been disagreement in the Lutheran Church were to be fixed, through the selection of certain positions through logical deductions from the symbols, according to the principle that Lutherans must interpret the Scriptures according to their symbols, the result must be either violations of conscience or a fragmentation of the Lutheran Church. Moreover, if a large and strong church were built through persuasion and pressure, the result must be a fanatization of its membership, which in the long run could lead only to a counter-reaction and a return to indifferentism. Agreement with Loehe on the reality of this danger induced the founders of the synod to form an organization for the purpose of counteracting excessive rigidity. The specific function of their synod was to combine with confessional fidelity and sound practice a moderate point of view toward doctrinal positions which still remained in a state of controversy, a point of view which considered such points as open questions, on which Lutherans faithful to confessions might differ and yet remain in church fellowship. It need not follow that all hope for complete agreement on open questions must be abandoned, for through scriptural studies a progress in theological understanding might be obtained which finally might lead to unanimity.

The consequence of this position was that the Iowa Synod became involved in bitter doctrinal controversy with the conservative Lutheran grouping, in which it sought to find its place and the development of which it considered one of its primary tasks. As a rigid right wing group grew strong, it grew more unwilling to come to terms with Iowa;

indeed it placed Iowa on the left or even denied it the right to bear the Lutheran name. The synod tried to end this controversy through modifications in some details of its positions and through clarification of misunderstandings of its purposes, but it became clear that recognition from the right wing could be obtained only through surrender of its opposition to a rigid dogmatism. This it was unwilling to do, with the result that it found itself defending middle ground between the General Synod and the Synodical Conference. Thus its part in the history of Lutheranism in America came to be maintenance of a firm stand for confessional fidelity and sound practice against unionism on the one hand, and insistence upon a sphere of open questions within which theological development might take place and opposition to narrow traditionalism on the other.

When reviving confessional consciousness in the East led to a separation of conservative Lutherans from the General Synod, an attempt to unite conservative synods was made. The General Council invited older eastern bodies and newer western synods, working among the recent immigrants of their section, to federate on basis of a doctrinal declaration stressing confessional fidelity. The Iowa Synod found the confessional basis of this organization acceptable. Since it avoided the doctrinal rigidity of the right wing and yet accepted the symbols unconditionally, the General Council represented an attempt to bring together in a single strong organization, the Lutheran bodies representing the middle ground between right and left wings. The synod found a stumbling block, however, in laxities of practice, common in many of the eastern synods. Its leaders understood that these were deeply rooted in the historic development of those synods and that they could not be eradicated at one stroke. So strongly, however, was the synod concerned with sound practice, that full membership in the General Council was not consummated. The synod cooperated with this body in practical affairs, it established church fellowship with its constituent bodies, and it attended its sessions to urge ceaselessly the adoption of sound rules on practice. Thus it maintained ties with this association of conservative Lutheran bodies and made a contribution through it toward strengthening confessional fidelity and toward promoting the cause of corresponding practice.

Since the Iowa Synod was absorbed in its mission within the Lutheran Church, its impact upon American society was made through its religious policies and practices. It worked primarily among recent immigrants, and did not understand its task to be to assist in their assimilation into American society, but rather to preserve their Lutheran heritage. In its early days it took the attitude that preservation of the German language was an essential part of this heritage. This attitude was modified as the years passed, but by 1879 the synod had gone no further than to accept the inevitability of the eventual adoption of the English language by its membership. Beyond provision for instruction in English in its parochial schools, which was necessitated by parental demands, it had developed no program looking toward a day, thought as yet to be distant, when its religious activities would be carried on in English, nor did it make an endeavor to reach population elements who spoke only English. While its parochial schools were considered an essential part of its program, their purpose, in part, was to combat the influence of the non-sectarian public schools. In such respects the policies to which the synod gave great stress therefore tended to delay rather than to promote the assimilation of its members into American society.

In certain respects the synod discovered that its principles conflicted with strong tendencies of American life. Secret societies of various kinds had obtained a strong hold and made a strong appeal to the average American. While social, recreational and economic factors were the essential elements in this appeal, religious sentiments were so deeply rooted in American thinking that secret societies usually adopted religious rituals and professed non-denominational, universalist religious tenets. This aspect of these organizations induced the synod to oppose them strongly. Its motives for doing so were sound, but in so far as the opposition was effective, it imposed a bar against a popular form of association and intermingling on the part of its members with other elements in American society. In the case of the Grangers this policy of the synod operated against participation of its members in a movement of protest against social injustice and, in so far as it was effective, closed the door against an effective form of cooperation with a non-Lutheran environment for the purpose of seeking remedies for common grievances.

To a degree, therefore, the synod tended to isolate its membership in its environment, to set it off as a special group within its communities intent on preserving its distinguishing characteristics and opposed to prevalent tendencies. It played its part in creating a common impression that Lutheranism was a foreign religion, uninterested in the problems of American society and bent only upon self-preservation. While this impression hardly did justice to the synod, it is true that its concern was limited to unchurched Lutherans and that its methods had a tendency to set them apart from their neighbors. It is also true that its clergy was not deeply conscious of social and economic problems or at least did not consider them to be of direct concern to the church. Its basic viewpoints were opposed to a legislative approach to such issues as the temperance problem, which were strongly supported by churches with Calvinist ways of thinking. The synod was exclusively concerned with a spiritual approach. Evil of all kinds was the consequence of sin; the duty of the church was to preach repentance and faith. It was also the duty of the church to emphasize Christian living. In a society which lived under the guidance of a strong faith, evils of all kinds would be controlled. An enlightened Christian national conscience was the primary requisite for an approach to social problems. What the synod could do for American society was faithfully to adhere in its own sphere to the task of creating such a conscience.

The contribution made by the Iowa Synod to the society in which it operated lay, therefore, in the purely religious sphere. In so far as it took part in the development of a confessional Lutheran attitude, it helped in building an agency devoted entirely to the spiritual welfare of humanity. In so far as it dealt with individuals, it strove to build a sound morality based upon a Christian faith. The degree of its success and of its value to the society in which it lived defies measurement. National achievement and national welfare will in the last analysis depend upon the moral fiber of the nation concerned. The Iowa Synod gave its entire endeavor to spiritual services which it believed would foster a sound morality. In so far as it succeeded it served to strengthen the moral fiber of the American people.

PART III

1879-1904

CHAPTER XXI

FUTURE: A SKETCH OF GROWTH TO 1904

As the Iowa Synod entered into its second quarter century it possessed three institutions of higher education. The seminary was well established and served the purpose of providing the major portion of the clergymen needed to carry on an expanding missionary program. The college was located on the same campus at Mendota and in part served by the same faculty. It was as yet too small to serve adequately the purpose of providing all the students of the seminary and limited facilities at Mendota inhibited a rapid development. The teachers' seminary had only just been founded to meet a need which had long been felt. It had not as yet graduated a class and as yet lacked a home and a campus, although the decisions which were to provide them at Waverly had been made in 1879.

Building plans at Waverly were hampered, because the synod had not appropriated funds for this purpose, in the expectation that the funds promised by the community would provide them, while the community pledges specified that payments were due on completion of the building. The school, therefore, was temporarily housed in rented quarters, while new pledges were secured.[1] During the next year a building was erected on a campus consisting of two city blocks. Construction costs exceeded the amount pledged by the community by far, and though considerable additional sums were raised, a large debt remained when the next synodical convention met in 1882.[2] That convention refused to accept the building and the debt which rested upon it.[3] Grossmann personally assumed the debt, hoping to be able to collect the funds necessary to reimburse himself,[4] so that by 1885 the building was debt free and accepted by the convention of that year.[5] Enrollment increased gradually, but the rated capacity of the building was not fully employed.[6]

---

[1] K. B. XXII, 158. Waverly had promised $4,000 and seems originally to have pledged that amount. The final accounting in 1885 credited Waverly and vicinity with payments of $3,164.07, Synodalbericht 1885, 45.

---

[2] Additional amounts raised were given *Ibid*., as $1,001.91 collected by Grossmann and $1,178.96 by Grossmann's son, while $1,621.48 was given as remitted by congregations to the synodical treasurer. It is probable that this included funds raised after 1882. The debt remaining in 1882 was given as $2,300, *Synodalbericht 1882*, 29.

[3] *Ibid*., 29.

[4] *K. B.* XXIX, 9, 68. This report states that in part the excess cost was due to underestimation of costs and in part to building on a larger scale than originally planned. Grossmann expected personally to raise the excess, but he was not able to get all he expected to get and some pledges were not paid, while interest consumed funds paid in. In 1885 he personally paid off the remaining debt, the amount of which was not given, but members of the synod expected to reimburse him. The report stated that an anonymous donor, undoubtedly Mr. F. Schack of Eldorado, who was later to make other substantial donations, had contributed $1,000 toward reimbursing Grossmann, which would meet about half the total amount and appealed for further contributions to this end. No further report on the matter appeared. *Synodalbericht 1885*, 45, gave a total of $2,473.71 as paid by anonymous and gave the total cost as $9,439.13, inclusive of $1,205.86 in interest.

[5] *K. B.* XXIX, 9, 68.

At Mendota meanwhile facilities were strained chiefly through a good enrollment at the seminary while that at the college remained unsatisfactory.[7] College students were required to live in a dormitory or in their own homes, while a large part of the seminary enrollment had to live in rented rooms. Conditions were obviously unsatisfactory and the college in particular could not develop into the strong institution, which eventually would supply the enrollment of the seminary, under such conditions. Continuing operating deficits, however, kept the institution in debt and militated against plans for additional construction to provide adequate space.[8] Since the space at Waverly was not fully used, the suggestion was made that the college might be transferred from Mendota to Waverly.[9] In 1884 the districts were asked to vote on a proposal to do this, but doubts prevailed whether the one or the other of the two institutions would not suffer as the result of such a combination and the vote was negative.[10]

---

[6] Enrollment figures up to 1882 were not given. The original class of six was joined by another of the same size in 1879, plus an unnamed number of local students, K. B. XXII, 16, 158. Estimates of increasing enrollment are based in part on the fact that the institution operated at a deficit until 1882 and showed a balance by 1885. Synodalbericht 1882 gives a deficit of $344.56 for a period of two and a half years and a total operating deficit of $882.14, while Synodalbericht 1885, 45, reports a balance of $311.31 for the years 1882-1885. The deficit from earlier years had been covered by a payment of $965.77 from the Kirchenblatt treasury in 1883, which would indicate that during 1883 the debt had increased somewhat, perhaps chiefly through interest accrual. Synodalbericht 1885, 30, reports that forty-four students had entered since 1882 and that eight additional students had graduated as teachers. Of the forty-four entrants nineteen took the normal course.

[7] Synodalbericht 1882, 16, does not break down enrollment figures since 1879 but reports that forty-seven students were admitted into the seminary in the last triennium of whom only six were graduates of the college, into which seventeen students, five of them non-theological, had been admitted. Synodalbericht 1885, 25-6, gives enrollment figures for the past triennium as fifty, fifty-three, sixty-four for the seminary, nineteen, fourteen, seventeen for the college. College students lived in a house which served as dormitory, while most of the seminarians were quartered in rooms rented by the seminary. Each school had two teachers and each at times had an additional instructor, the seminary staff carrying part of the college load, p. 32.

---

[8] In 1879 the seminary debt had stood at $3,256.10 about half of which the seminary charged to transferred Galena obligations. The Jubilee offering yielded only $86.75 for purposes of reduction of this debt. The seminary, however, was able to pay off an additional $805.14 during the next year and sale of the seminary farm retired an additional $1,600, so that by 1881 the debt was down to $764.27. During the next year a deficit of $387.50 increased the debt so that in 1882 it stood at $1,157.77, Synodalbericht 1882, 29. During the next three years deficits ran to $521.43, $917.85, $1,177.45. A special offering raised $763.45 which with other smaller amounts was applied to debt reduction, so that in 1885 the debt stood at $2,904.95, Synodalbericht 1885, 29. In 1882 it had been reported that outstanding student accounts would pay the debt and some attempt at collection was made with decreasing results in the next years, yielding a total of $294.28.

[9] A letter, undated and unaddressed, signed G. G., in I. S. D., may mark the origin of this suggestion. It referred to the heavy burden on the Mendota staff and suggested that either more help be employed there or that the college, be moved to Waverly, estimating that the combined staffs could carry the burden without increasing the total staff, but expressing doubts about the feasibility of combining the two institutions without injury to either. Space was not mentioned.

[10] The Northern District voted against transfer of the entire college, but suggested that the two lower classes be transferred, K. B. XXVII, 15, 130. The Southern District favored transfer of only the lowest class, 16, 130. The Eastern District was totally opposed, 22, 173. The Western District heard an adverse report, but took no action at all, 20, 158. The districts also voted down a suggestion to hold

Several of the districts had, however, favored a partial transfer, and the basic problem remained unaltered. A plan was therefore drawn up which was designed to meet the misgivings expressed. The teachers' seminary had a three-year and the college a four-year course. The two lower classes in each school were to be combined, which it was thought could readily be done. The upper class of the teachers' seminary and the two upper classes of the college were to be taught separately. But even under this arrangement several subjects could be taken in common, so that four teachers could carry the load. This would relieve the heavily overburdened seminary faculty, but would not necessitate additional teachers if the two from Mendota would join the two at Waverly.[11] This plan was submitted to the convention of 1885, which decided to adopt its essential features and to make the institution at Waverly the college with a normal department, designed to meet all the needs of synodical congregations for higher education. The college course, however, was to be lengthened to five years

---

the next convention, scheduled for Toledo, in the west. Whether this influenced the vote on the college question can not be stated, the reasons were explained, 15, 114, as given in the text. Perhaps the Waverly debt, not yet cleared, also influenced the vote. Waverly had only the one building now known as Old Main, which housed both staff and students as well as all activities. It might have been able to house the few college students from Mendota, but it hardly provided room for expansion of the college.

[11] K. B. XXVIII, 6, 41-2. The space problem at Mendota was not mentioned, but space at Waverly was declared to be adequate.

once more and a fifth teacher was authorized. The transfer took place in the fall of 1885 and the college thereafter was called Wartburg College.[12]

While the removal of the college to Waverly provided a measure of relief at Mendota, the seminary enrollment remained good and the facilities were still inadequate.[13] By 1888 the necessity of building in order to provide sufficient space had become apparent. Mendota submitted an offer to the convention of that year to raise funds to defray a portion of building costs.[14] Properties were, however, also offered to the synod by St. Paul and by Dubuque, if the seminary were relocated in those cities.[15] The offer of St. Paul was declined by the convention, because the location was not central. Mendota's offer found advocates, who held that adequate facilities could be provided there at the least cost and pointed to central, easily accessible, location with a group of surrounding congregations.[16] A majority, however, favored acceptance of the Dubuque offer, if the terms of the offer should prove to be reliable.[17] A committee was named to carry on the necessary negotiations and a special appeal to raise the funds was authorized.[18]

---

[12] Synodalbericht 1885, 32-3. The space problem at Mendota seems to have been the decisive factor. The two faculties were to outline the curriculum and this was to be reviewed after a year. The transfer was to be effected by September 1, 1885. Grossmann was to be head of the school and $800 was appropriated for a house for him, should he feel it desirable to move from his quarters in the school building. He was to receive $600, the second teacher $500, the third and fourth $400 all plus rent. One of the four was to serve as pastor of the Waverly congregation and $150 was to be deducted from his salary. The earlier reports had been averse to employment of instructors, but the fifth teacher was to be an instructor and to receive $200 and room and board. The author has found no resolution on a name. Neither the college nor the teachers' seminary had received official names, but the name Wartburg had gone with the seminary from St. Sebald to Mendota and had probably been applied to the college also while it was there. After the transfer to Waverly the name Wartburg College was applied to the combined institutions there.

[13] Synodalbericht 1888, 27-8, gives the enrollment for the triennium as fifty-seven, forty-nine and fifty-two. For the same period a deficit of $1,332.80 was reported, but the older debt had been paid. The school year had not ended when the report was written and it may be that further income was in prospect, for the synod appropriated $739 from the surplus in the synodical treasury to cover the deficit, p. 75.

[14] Mendota offered to raise $2,000. Construction costs for one wing added to the existing building were estimated at $6,030, for two wings, $8,600.

---

[15] St. Paul offered a site of ten acres said to be worth $20,000 for $10,000. The synod might, if it chose, resell part of the tract to raise funds for building. Dubuque offered the present site of thirty-one acres, a private estate with a large house and an outbuilding, which the city would buy and give to the synod. Costs in Dubuque, for an addition, alterations and residences for the staff, plus moving expenses were estimated at $10,000. No cost estimate for St. Paul was given. Synodalbericht 1888, 36.

[16] Ibid., 36-7. A minority report to the convention favored acceptance of the Mendota offer for the reasons given. Opponents held that it would be inadvisable to build extensive additions onto an old structure.

[17] Ibid., 37. The resolution provided for acceptance of the Dubuque offer, provided that a clear title could be given and costs did not exceed $10,000. If these terms could not be met the Mendota offer was to be accepted and construction undertaken there for not more than $8,600.

[18] Ibid., 37-8. The Ausschuss together with three laymen was to investigate and Dubuque was to act by August 15. This body was to select a building committee. A director was named for the appeal, which was to be carried on by each conference under supervision of district presidents. The appeal was to be taken by the end of the year and no construction was to begin until two-thirds of the needed funds were on hand.

The negotiations proceeded satisfactorily and thus the seminary prepared to return to the city, where it had first become a theological institution and which it had left thirty years earlier. A beautiful site at the southwestern edge of the city became its new home. A large house on the site was rebuilt and enlarged and provided with steam heat, though not with plumbing and light, and two residences for the staff were built. The costs very considerably exceeded the estimates, but the special appeal brought in a good deal more than had been expected, so that no building debt remained.[19] The seminary was able to move into its new home at the beginning of the school year 1889-90, but it suffered a heavy loss, when Prof. Gottfried Fritschel died in Mendota in the summer of 1889, shortly before the removal.

---

[19] Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 259, gives the total costs as $18,142.17, the yield of the appeal as $18,058.67, p. 258, and adds that the Mendota property was soon sold for $2,300. Synodalbericht 1890, 18, gives the yield of the appeal as $16,151.83 and reports that $272.58 was appropriated from the synodical treasury to cover a building deficit, p. 19. That convention also gave approval to exceeding of the cost limit, p. 37, and voted construction of an additional residence, p. 43, and compensation to the professors for losses resulting from the sale of their houses in Mendota, p. 36. These costs may have been added to Deindoerfer's total, while the discrepancy in the yield of the appeal may be explained by subsequent payment of pledges. Synodalbericht 1893, 84, appropriated $572 to S. Fritschel who had lost $800 on the sale of his Mendota home, but had collected $228 in rent before selling it. He accepted the appropriation but turned the amount over to the seminary fund. Mrs. G. Fritschel had not yet sold her house in Mendota, but the convention provided for its sale and for payment to her of the difference between the sale price and the original investment.

[20] Synodalbericht 1890, 38.

This death called attention emphatically to the necessity of expanding the seminary staff. Since 1873 employment of a third teacher had received consideration in order to relieve the burden upon the two theological professors, who in addition to heavy teaching loads, carried editorial duties and were active in most synodical affairs. Instructors had been employed at least at times in Mendota, but since they usually left after a few years this solution was deemed unsatisfactory. It was, therefore, decided not only to replace G. Fritschel, but to call a third professor.[21] W. Proehl was immediately chosen to fill the vacancy, but the third position continued to be filled by instructors, sons of the two Fritschels serving brief terms, until in 1893 Max Fritschel was promoted to a professorship.[22] A fourth teacher had been authorized as early as 1888, because after the removal of the college, it was again considered advisable to arrange for a preparatory year for older students wishing to enter the seminary without formal college training. This arrangement was to cause a good deal of difficulty, but the need of a fourth teacher came to be felt more and more strongly. Although attempts were made to fill the position after 1893, it was not until 1901 that W. A. Sadtler was called to serve as English professor.[23] In the meantime S. Fritschel had been stricken with illness in 1899 and had died in 1900. Though he had remained partially active, M. Reu had been called in 1899 to relieve him and became his successor.[24] With the death of S. Fritschel, the last of the three men who had developed the seminary, passed from the scene after nearly a half century of service. Reu was for many decades to be the dominant personality at the seminary.

---

[21] Synodalbericht 1890, 39, reports the election of W. Proehl to replace G. Fritschel and that Hermann Fritschel, replaced George Fritschel who had been instructor since 1887, both were sons of G. Fritschel. Grossmann's presidential report, pp. 13-15, dealt with the necessity of granting relief from overburdens, implying that unless the synod wished to kill off S. Fritschel prematurely also, the third professorship must be established.

[22] Synodalbericht 1893, indicates that calls had been extended to Richter and to John Fritschel, the oldest surviving son of S. Fritschel, but that both had declined. Hermann Fritschel had been replaced as instructor in 1891 by Max Fritschel, also a son of S. Fritschel. The promotion of the latter in 1893 was reported Synodalbericht 1896, 102-3. G. Weng had been called as fourth professor, but had declined. For an attempt to secure a German theologian for a chair at the seminary see footnote 85.

Little change seems to have taken place during the period in the curriculum of the seminary or methods of instruction. The enrollment dropped from a level of fifty or more students in the early eighties toward forty later in that decade and down toward thirty in the nineties.[25] The chief reason was steady diminution of the number of students coming from Germany.[26] While efforts were made to build up the college, during the period it never reached the point of being able regularly to furnish as many as ten or twelve graduates per year. The problem of steady supply of students led to efforts to strengthen a proseminary department for the purpose of preparing older men for a practical course. For some years proseminary training was given in a fourth year added to the seminary course. Later this department was transferred to Waverly after the college had been moved to Clinton, so that both schools prepared men for the seminary.[27] Seminary finances were in better condition than in debt-ridden earlier years, but a larger staff and a smaller enrollment spelled deficits from time to time, particularly when extensive property improvements became necessary.[28] Student support also remained a problem, but in the late nineties a special fund, the Alpha Stiftung, was established through a major donation and after the death of S. Fritschel another fund was collected and the Sigmund Fritschel Stiftung established in his memory. Income from both funds went toward student support, although that of the latter could be applied in part toward stipends for graduate study.[29]

---

[23] Synodalbericht 1888, 38; Synodalbericht 1902, 45.

[24] Ibid., 41, 44; Synodalbericht 1899, 48.

[25] For the triennium 1885-8, the enrollment was fifty-seven, forty-nine, fifty-two students, Synodalbericht 1888, 28; for the next two years thirty-nine and forty-three, Synodalbericht 1890, 41; for 1890-3, forty-six, fifty-two, forty-two, Synodalbericht 1893, 67; for 1893-7, no figures were given; for 1899-1902, forty-two, thirty-one, thirty-one, Synodalbericht 1902, 45; for 1902-4, forty, thirty-three, Synodalbericht 1904, 48.

---

[26] Melsungen no longer sent students during this period and Neuendettelsau was now furnishing pastors also for Australia and missionaries for New Guinea. Synodalbericht 1902, 46, reported that in the past triennium only two German students had come to the seminary, both from Strackholt and urged renewal of relations with German centers.

[27] Permission to add a fourth class to the seminary course for preparatory courses was given in 1888, Synodalbericht 1888, 39, and by 1890 the class was functioning, though the lack of an additional teacher hampered the work, Synodalbericht 1890, 41. In 1896 the synod left the organization of a proseminary to the faculties at Dubuque and Waverly, Synodalbericht 1896, 106, a curriculum receiving provisional approval. By 1899 the proseminary course had been at Waverly for three years and had had a total enrollment of twenty-seven students, four, twelve, eleven respectively for the three years and had sent nine graduates to the seminary, Synodalbericht 1899, 66-7. In 1904 the seminary reported that college work still had to be offered for proseminary students and that some students could not be sent to Waverly for preparation at all. The course needed reorganization and it might be best to bring it back to the seminary, adding two years to its curriculum for this purpose, Synodalbericht 1904, 47.

---

[28] In 1890 $418.23 was appropriated from the synodical treasury to cover an operating deficit, Synodalbericht 1890, 19. In 1893 a debt of $1,739.89 was reported, which seems, however, to have been due to unpaid pledges from the building appeal, Synodalbericht 1893, 29. In 1896 the debt stood at $257.13, but it was stated to be due to the construction of a third residence, Synodalbericht 1896, 106. Apparently deficits were incurred in the next three years, indebtedness of $773.21 being reported in 1899 with the remark that the balance in the treasury was sufficient to cover it, Synodalbericht 1899, 48. After 1900 extensive improvements were made in heating, plumbing, lighting in the seminary and its residences. Synodalbericht 1902 reported no debts, but Synodalbericht 1904, 46, stated that repairs and improvements had left a deficit of about $1,000.

[29] These funds were additional to the old seminary fund which by 1882 amounted to $10,563.30, Synodalbericht 1882, 20, and which also still had some funds in Russia and later received S. Fritschel's compensation for his Mendota loss. The Alpha Stiftung received a gift of $3,000 from Pastor Michaelsen and paid stipends of $40 per year, Synodalbericht 1899, 46. The same report indicated that efforts were being made to collect more from students, p. 47. In 1893 it had been reported that most students needed support and that a synodical allotment of $70 per year was often insufficient, Synodalbericht 1893, 68-9. The convention of 1902 authorized the raising of a fund of $10,000 in memory of S. Fritschel for student support, K. B. XLVII, 5, 57. A committee reported in 1904 that $6,688.50 had been pledged and that additional sums were unreported. It was recommended that further pledges be solicited and that interest be added to capital until the fund reached $10,000.

The institution at Waverly which combined college and normal school in the meantime was flourishing modestly. Enrollment increased somewhat, but hardly enough at least in the college to meet synodical needs.[30] The combination of the courses did not give full satisfaction. In the earlier years the demands of the normal course were lighter than those of the college, with the result that students tended to transfer to the easier course. This was adjusted by making the normal courses more demanding. Even so, there were difficulties in having students of the two courses instructed in common in the lower classes, because their objectives required differing emphases. After a few years the normal course began to lose ground and the administration reported that only separation of the institutions could prevent it from dying out.[31] The

---

The regulations provided that stipends of $50 be paid to needy students on basis of scholarship and that occasionally grants of $350 be made to properly qualified candidates for graduate study in Germany or America, *Synodalbericht 1904*, 109-10.

[30] *Synodalbericht 1888*, 30-31, gives the enrollment for the first triennium as forty-nine, sixty-two, fifty-nine. In the first year there were twenty normal students, four graduates were teachers, four went to the seminary; in the second eight teachers graduated; in the third there were no graduates, but fourteen students were in the normal course, thirty were pre-theological. In the next biennium the enrollment was sixty-two, sixty-two; nine teachers graduated and five graduates went to the seminary, *Synodalbericht 1890*, 45-6. In the next triennium the enrollment was sixty-eight, seventy, sixty-seven, with nine teachers graduating and fourteen graduates going to the seminary, *Synodalbericht 1893*, 70-1. In every year there were students who left, were dismissed, or failed to return.

[31] *Synodalbericht 1888*, 34; *1890*, 47; *1893*, 74. As early as 1890 the synod instructed the Ausschuss to plan a separation as soon as possible and to consider use of the Mendota property, *Synodalbericht 1890*, 48-9.

faculty reported that there was also need for a preparatory class as a foundation for both courses, which was authorized in 1890, and in 1893 it recommended that the college course be extended to six years.[32]

With expanding enrollment and curricular development of both the normal and the college courses the institution felt a need for more equipment and for more space. Gifts and appropriations helped to provide equipment and build up the library.[33] Accommodation of more equipment and more students, and contemplated curricular expansion through addition of a commercial course, in turn put a strain on existing facilities. The convention of 1888 authorized erection of a second building to accommodate kitchen, dining room and to provide housing space for personnel. An anonymous donor provided the funds for this building and also donated additional land.[34] Although the staff was gradually increased to seven teachers, the college was generally in sound financial condition and free of debt, the generous donations which it received no doubt were an important factor in this state of affairs.[35] Increasing enrollment, abetted through organized synodical effort, and regular collection of student payments were contributory factors.[36]

---

[32] Synodalbericht 1888, 31-2, reported that only four classes had existed at most times during the first triennium and that only four teachers had been engaged. The preparatory class was suggested. The synod did not authorize this class at that time, but made provision for the fifth class, by authorizing engagement of another professor or of two instructors. The latter alternative undoubtedly was suggested in view of the need to strengthen the normal course and of schedule difficulties, p. 40. A business course on a self-supporting basis was also authorized, p. 39. In 1890 the preparatory class was again requested and granted, Synodalbericht 1890, 47-9. In 1893 the faculty asked that the college course be extended, the preparatory course to offer no Latin, the remaining courses to carry fewer subjects, but to increase hours per week given to these subjects. The model still was the German Gymnasium and the course was heavily classical, Latin being given throughout the six years and Greek for four. The synod approved the extension, but provided that the preparatory course serve both college and normal school in view of the intended separation of the two schools. This could not be carried out, but the college retained the preparatory course. Except for occasional separation of the preparatory course into two classes this arrangement constituted the final curriculum, until the world war period. Synodalbericht 1893, 74-7.

[33] Synodalbericht 1882, 29, mentions that $50 from the special appeal of 1879 was allotted for the Waverly library. K. B. XXIX, 9, 68, indicates that the same donor who reimbursed Grossmann had also given $1,000 for college equipment. Synodalbericht 1888, 33, mentions expansion of the library from 600 to 1,150 volumes and a good museum and p. 40 reports an appropriation of $200 for science equipment.

---

[34] The building, a large frame structure, was erected between 1888 and 1890 and still serves its purpose. It is now known as North Hall. The donor was again Mr. F. Schack. He gave the college three additional city blocks to the north and to the south of the original two blocks stretching east and west. The writer identified Mr. Schack, whose name was never mentioned in the documents, through an interview with Mr. A. Engelbrecht, whose long term of service in Waverly began in this period. Synodalbericht 1888, 34 and 40, contains the request for the building and authority to erect it; Synodalbericht 1890, 45, mentions construction and donation of land.

[35] The synodical reports from 1885 to 1893 report no debts. Between 1890 and 1892 deficits were incurred, but during the next year the loans were paid off, Synodalbericht 1893, 75-7. P. 71, the teaching staff is reported as standing at seven since 1890. Salaries were raised in 1888, the second professor receiving $600 (Lutz), the third $500 (Kraushaar), the fourth $450 (J. Fritschel). Kraushaar also replaced Grossmann as Hausvater and received an extra $100 for this service, Synodalbericht 1888, 40. Rentals were additional. In 1890 Grossmann's salary was raised to $800 without house, which the Synodalkasse may have furnished. Kraushaar was to receive $700 and J. Fritschel $550 plus house, Synodalbericht 1890, 48.

In 1892 the board of regents of the college came to the conclusion that another building was a vital necessity. The existing facilities were overcrowded, neither the business course nor the preparatory class, both authorized by the synod and both vitally needed, could be organized for lack of space.[37] Accordingly plans were developed for a building costing about $12,000 and an offer was secured from Waverly to raise $3,000 for this purpose.[38] These plans were then submitted to the district conventions of 1892 for approval. In the meantime an offer from Peoria of a site of ten acres and of assistance for a building fund was received, which was also submitted to the districts.[39] Almost all the district conventions approved the plan for building in Waverly and acceptance of Waverly's offer, the Southern District, however, added a resolution requesting that building be delayed until the next general convention should again have approved the project.[40]

---

[36] *Synodalbericht 1893*, 70-1, reports that efforts were made to collect annual student payments of $80 in full with considerable success. *Synodalbericht 1885*, 33-4, contains a paper by Bredow on student solicitation which contained recommendations adopted by the synod to pastors to win gifted youths for the service of the church, to the *Kirchenblatt* to publish reports, and to conferences, districts and general conventions to check and report on results. *Synodalbericht 1888*, 6, reports on enforcement. Whether the efforts were continued is not clear, in the Western District during hard times, they aroused opposition. See *Synodalbericht Westl. Dist. 1889*, 8, 10, 16-7; *1891*, 19.

[37] *K. B.* XXXV, 6, 41. Stress was placed on the lack of living room for the students, who studied in classrooms and slept in dormitories. Capacity of the building was given as forty-five, but it then housed sixty-five.

[38] *Ibid.*, 14, 111. The plans provided for 150 students, *Synodalbericht Westl. Dist. 1892*, 27. A committee reporting on the project there thought this excessive and recommended planning for a capacity of 100 with a building costing $6,000 and arranged for future expansion. The district rejected this, however, and voted for the original plan.

The Southern District voted for delay, because a third project, the Clinton plan, had been submitted to it. According to this project, a lumber magnate in that river city would sell a farm of ninety-seven acres, beautifully situated at the western edge of the city, and reputed to be worth as much as

---

[39] K. B. XXXV, 11, 86. Kraushaar and Grossmann had investigated this offer. The site was about two miles from the center of the city and was reported to be worth $10-12,000. An improvement association was to raise building funds, but no amount was specified. City and press were reported to be enthusiastic. The Ausschuss voted to refer this to the districts, but no direct mention of it occurs in the district reports and the project received no further publicity. Undoubtedly the Clinton plan overshadowed it.

[40] Ibid., 14, 111, for the Northern District, 15, 118, for the Eastern District, and 119 for the Wisconsin District, 20, 159, for the Western District, 21, 166, for the Southern District. Some suspicion of the Waverly offer manifested itself in provisions that the Waverly payments be made in cash in advance, or that reliable guarantees be secured. This dated back to the experience of 1879 as did an Eastern District provision that the sum of $12,000 should not be exceeded under any circumstances. Several districts also favored delay until two-thirds of the required sums should be on hand. The Southern District heard a presentation of the Clinton plan and this accounted for the request for delay until a general convention could meet. It named a committee to investigate in Clinton. Another resolution favoring separation of college and normal school narrowly failed to pass, Synodalbericht Suedl. Dist. 1892, 21-22. The Western District resolved to separate the normal school and to move it farther east , while after a time an academy was to be established in the Western District, Synodalbericht Westl. Dist. 1892, 23-9. The Dakota District alone did not act on the Waverly plan. The Clinton plan had been publicized by the time it met and

$75,000, for $25,000 to an improvement company which would subdivide it into 334 building lots, reserving a campus of seventeen acres for the college. The lots would be offered for sale at $300 in Clinton and throughout the synod. If all were sold more than $115,000 would be realized, of which about $47,000 could pay for the farm and for promotion, levelling and grading costs, leaving $75,000 which would form a building fund for the college. The synod would thus without cost or risk obtain a magnificent site for its college as well as a plant exceeding its rosiest hopes. Investors were assured that Clinton was a rapidly expanding community, growing inevitably in the direction of the campus, so that purchasers of lots would be making a sound investment.[41]

The Southern District had named a committee which was to visit Clinton and look into the project. This was done

---

it resolved in its favor and recommended separation of the two schools if it were accepted, Synodalbericht Dak. Dist. 1892, 22-3.

[41] A pamphlet, Wartburg College, 5-10, contains this information and gives details on arrangements. The improvement company was to handle all business affairs and the synod was to take over the property only after a sufficient number of lots had been sold to pay for the site. The owner of the farms was Mr. C. Lamb. Pastor O. Hartmann of Clinton described the genesis of the plan, K. B. XXXV, 23, 181. It had been suggested to Hartmann that he secure an offer from Clinton. He consulted several local men, but at first received little encouragement. He then saw Mr. H. W. Seaman of the Clinton Improvement Company, who was uninterested in a small college project, but enthusiastic for a project on a grand scale. It was Seaman who developed the project and handled affairs. Hartmann stated that no land was available in the vicinity of the projected site for less than $500 per acre and that prices ranged as high as $1,000 per acre. Seaman estimated the value of the site as at least $75,000, XXXVI, 2, 12.

and a favorable report was submitted to the Ausschuss. This body ruled that since a majority of districts had approved the Waverly plan, this action constituted a valid synodical decision under the constitution, which it had no power to set aside in favor of the Clinton plan. Since it seemed desirable, however, that a general convention should reconsider the action, it was decided to send a circular to all pastors, informing them of the state of affairs. They were to consult their congregations and then to report whether or not they favored holding the Waverly plan in abeyance until the general convention of the next year could meet. They were also to indicate whether they favored permission for the Clinton Improvement Company at its own risk to secure an option on the site and to solicit subscriptions for purchases of lots.[42] The response to this circular was favorable,[43] and the improvement company proceeded at once to promote the sale of lots.[44] As the Clinton plan gained favor, its advocates proposed that the two institutions involved should again be separated, the normal school to remain at Waverly, while the college was to be located in the new plant at Clinton.[45]

---

[42] Wartburg College, 6-7. The district committee consisted of Richter, Kraushaar and Schack and it was accompanied by Grossmann on its visit.

[43] The favorable response is deduced from the fact that the promotion got under way. The writer's incomplete research in the sources has not brought to light a record of the actual vote.

[44] Subscribers were to pay down $100, a second installment of $100 was due when the synod should take over the property, and the third ninety days thereafter. The down payments were paid into a special fund administered by A. Engelbrecht, the treasurer of the college. They were to be returned to the subscribers if the synod did not accept the plan. Until the synod should act, the improvement company handled all affairs, except administration of moneys received, at its own risk, Ibid., 5, 10, 14-15. Lots were eventually to be distributed

The convention of 1893 met at Clinton in the spring of the year. It inspected the site and heard reports on the promotion, which indicated that about half the lots had been sold.[46] After this introduction the convention resolved to

---

by lot. In the next year an alternate payment plan was announced under which subscribers might pay down $50 and pay in installments of $50 at six month intervals, plus interest at 6 per cent on unpaid amounts, K. B. XXXVI, 8, 60. Several individuals enthusiastically supported the project, extolling the advantages of the site and the opportunity to secure a splendid institution, in the synodical organ, Pastor Romberg, XXXV, 12, 189; an unsigned writer, 26, 205; A. Engelbrecht, XXXVI, 8, 60.

[45] It will be remembered that this suggestion had been under consideration for some time, the prospect of securing a splendid site and a large plant without cost to the synod merely brought it to a head. That misgivings existed as to whether the synod could afford to maintain three institutions is evident from an article considering this point by Kraushaar in K. B. XXXV, 25, 195-6. It pointed out that receipts for maintenance of educational institutions had almost tripled within the preceding decade. Separation would increase expenses, but it would not double them until both institutions grew to the present size of the college, which would occur in time, but not immediately. The college regents endorsed the Clinton plan with its implications, provided that sale of lots proceeded favorably, 27, 212. The presidential report to the convention of 1893 called attention to a remarkable increase in receipts for educational purposes during the preceding triennium, Synodalbericht 1893, 7, 28, 29.

[46] Seaman furnished transportation to take the members to the site. They were said to have been favorably impressed and laymen particularly were reported to have been enthusiastic about the scheme. Seaman attended a session in which the project was discussed, giving information and estimating that sales up to that time provided for land purchase and other costs and left approximately $20,000 for building costs, K. B. XXXVI, 10, 76-7. Beilage to the same issue reports that 174 lots had been taken up, which would have left only $12,000 over previous cost estimates. It may be that an agreement had been reached that promotion expenses were to be met by

approve the Clinton plan and to take over the property. Efforts to sell lots were to be continued and a committee was to take charge of all affairs. Building, however, was not to be undertaken until sales had yielded $40,000 above purchase and subdivision costs. When the building was completed the normal school was to remain at Waverly, while the college was to be transferred to Clinton.[47] The president was also authorized to raise additional funds by a special appeal or otherwise, should that be necessary.

The site was purchased and a drawing held shortly afterward to assign the lots already bought. Further sales were pushed with energy and soon plans to begin building in the fall were under way. The panic of 1893, however, interfered with sales later in the year, even though prices on

---

assigning lots to the improvement company, the cost estimate for this purpose had been $5,200. Expenses for grading, etc., had been estimated at $10,000, while the price of the land was $25,000.

[47] *Synodalbericht* *1893*, 64-5, 77. The committee was to consist of Richter, Luz, Kraushaar and locally Hartmann and Mr. Mathiesen. It might coopt additional members. The president was to recommend purchase of lots to members of congregations. It was estimated that sale of seventy-five additional lots would assure the building, but apparently Seaman had promised to sell seventy-five lots locally not all of which had yet been taken up, but which were counted in the total reported to synod. As to the separation, only Grossmann and Engelbrecht were to remain in Waverly, the rest of the staff was to come to Clinton, where the seven-year program for the college was to be carried out. *K*. *B*. XXXVI, 11, 85, reported that the Clinton resolutions were carried unanimously.

the less desirable lots were cut in half.[48] The building committee still hoped to reach the minimum goal, but because sales moved slowly, not during the current year. It thereupon took another mail vote, seeking authority to lay the foundation in the fall, so that the building could be completed in time for the following school year. Receiving a large favorable majority the contract was let.[49] Further endeavors were made to push sale of lots, but since there was now little hope of exceeding the minimum, the authorized special appeal was taken in the spring of 1894.[50] Returns were hardly encouraging, but the building was completed and dedicated in the fall.[51] When an accounting of costs was made in 1896 a building debt of $33,166 was reported.[52]

---

[48] Deindoerfer, now president, reported the action and recommended purchases of lots, though he avoided extravagant claims. Purchase should not result in loss to anyone, but that was in God's hand, K. B. XXXVI, 10, Beilage. A little later it was reported that the land had been bought, that sixty-five more lots needed to be sold and that it was hoped construction could begin in the fall, 13, 100. The drawing was described 21, 165, and announcement made of reduced prices. About $30,000 had then been paid in, p. 166, and an appeal was made to pay installments due so that plans could proceed. About 200 lots on the other side of the Mill Creek were reduced to $200 and $150 because of the panic and they were to be sold in turn rather than by lot, 22, 171.

[49] The committee, besides making the purchase and conducting the drawing, had adopted a layout, begun grading and consulted architects. The building was planned in conjunction with the faculty at Waverly and was to cost $35,000, while $10,000 was allotted to construction of four residences. Construction of the foundation was begun, but bad weather prevented completion in 1893. No damage resulted and the building was ready by the fall of 1894, Synodalbericht 1896, 135-7. The result of the mail vote was 235 yes, thirty no, and some abstentions, p. 10.

[50] Ibid., 137-9. The committee still hoped to get $40,000 from lot sales, but it estimated its needs at $54,000 and hoped to raise $15,000 by a special appeal. It needed about $6,000 more from lot sales. Its point of view was that after the property had been taken over and early sales had become irrevocable, fairness to the buyers obligated the synod

---

to proceed. While depression slowed sales, it also reduced building costs and the committee estimated that $8,000 had been saved in this way. To raise additional funds quickly it dispensed with personal solicitation in the appeal, but sent out coin cases to pastors. The yield obtained through this method was disappointing, the total was given as $9,609.90, pp. 42, 47. Lot sales also lagged badly. The appeal was authorized by the Ausschuss, pp. 10-11, and announced in K. B. XXXVII, 8, 65, with special recommendation to members who did not buy lots. The announcement indicated that about $10,000 was needed.

[51] The building was a large brick structure, with full basement and four upper stories. It was designed to house 200 students and all educational facilities as well as a resident teacher and a janitor with their families. Students were to have individual study rooms, but to sleep in large dormitories. The fourth floor was not finished, which diminished the capacity, which in any case seems to have been overrated. While the building had steam heat and water, electric wiring was omitted, because of the cost and because medical advice opposed electric light. A gas machine was installed instead, which never worked well and went out of service some years later, Synodalbericht 1896, 140. Dedication took place October 9, 1894.

[52] The committee reported that 216 lots had been sold for $65,393.39. Less expenses the yield was $60,943.39 of which $50,242.90 had been paid and $10,700.49 was outstanding. A synodical committee regarded $4,450 of the amount outstanding as doubtful. Besides the $25,000 for the site, $45,913.54 had gone for building costs, the college building somewhat exceeding the estimates, while four houses had been constructed for $6,685.10. Furnishings had cost $2,706.05, miscellaneous items such as sewer construction $2,557.93, while subdivision, grading, etc., had cost $6,509.55, Ibid., 141-3. It may be noted that the contractor who erected the plant went bankrupt and that mechanics' liens were filed against the property. Mr. Seaman had, however, drawn the contract to protect the synod against this contigency. Litigation resulted, but the synod paid no more than the contract price.

The convention of 1896 approved the action of the Clinton committee and authorized a further appeal to cover the debt.[53] Efforts had already been made with some success to float small notes bearing no interest or low rates in order to reduce bank loans with high interest rates.[54] Efforts to pay off the debt met with small success, however, during the next triennium.[55] The convention of 1899 provided for a continuation of the appeal and also for a special collector who was to conduct it and to solicit larger contributions.[56]

---

[53] Ibid., 144-5. It took cognizance of the panic and of the mail vote of 1893 and endorsed the position that the synod was obligated to build, once investments had been made. A resolution was carried, however, abolishing future mail votes.

[54] K. B. XXXIX, 6, Beilage, recommended a plan, already communicated to pastors, to the readers. Non-interest-bearing notes for $10 and notes for $50, bearing five per cent or no interest, and running three to seven years were to raise $15,000 to pay off bank loans at 7 per cent. Receipts totalling $5,000 were reported 10, 122, but no further mention was made of these notes.

[55] The presidential report to the convention of 1899 brought sharp censure for a hostile attitude, widespread throughout the synod, many congregations doing little and many others refusing to do anything at all. Deindoerfer admitted that the synod had made a mistake in 1893, but stated emphatically that this did not justify refusal to meet the debt. Only about $6,000 had been paid off, much of the money raised going to interest payments, Synodalbericht 1899, 11-12. Through 1893 a total of $12,084.38 had been raised, while only $512 had been paid on lots, p. 32. The debt was reported as $24,558.36, but K. B. XLII, 11, 123 gave it as $26,866.

[56] Ibid., 61-3. Cognizance was again taken of hostility, but the debt and its payment were a point of honor. The appeal was to be raised in congregations which had done little or nothing. The collector was to be entitled to a vicar and to travel costs, but was not to draw a salary. He was to appoint assistants in every conference and to raise the appeal through the local pastor, the conference assistants, or in person. Subscriptions were taken for substantial gifts, pay-

Pastor H. Bergstedt became collector and made heroic endeavors to raise the necessary amounts. Two individual donations of $5,000 each were secured.[57] Late in 1900 he was able to announce that the debt had been covered.[58] Payment of pledges gave some trouble, so that a small debt was still outstanding in 1902.[59] By 1904 the last payment had been made.[60] Inclusive of interest

---

ment coming due three months after the entire amount was covered. This plan had already been suggested in K. B. XLII, 11, 124. A total of forty-eight donors had pledged $4,060 in amounts ranging from $1,000 to $15 on condition that sixty-seven others pledge $100, 192 $50 and 188 $25 in order to pay off the entire debt. A plan to pay off debt through insurance loans covered by policies to mature in fifteen years and another under which 200 individuals would pledge annual payments of $12 for ten years were also suggested, 16, 183.

[57] Synodalbericht 1902, 68. In the college report one of them is credited to Mr. F. Kohl, Danforth, Illinois, and another of $4,000 to an anonymous giver, who was Mr. F. Schack. He had undoubtedly also subscribed the $1,000 mentioned in the preceding footnote, bringing his total to $5,000. The board reported that morale was low in the summer of 1900, only about $3,000 having been raised until then, but that these large gifts broke the back of the debt, pp. 58-9. Mr. A. Engelbrecht identified Mr. Schack in an interview with the writer.

[58] K. B. XLIII, 25, 308.

[59] Bergstedt reported that the debt amounted to $27,866 when he became collector and that he raised $22,900.52, attributing the remainder to others. He took credit for the two large donations and for three of $200 and thirty-five of $100. Besides these he listed 502 other individual contributors. Details on the appeal were not given. He noted strong opposition, but gave generous credit to conference collectors. His expenses amounted to $106.15, additional printing costs were borne by the college. The debt still outstanding amounted to $1,480.28, covered by $1,987.25 on hand or receivable, Synodalbericht 1902, 68-70.

[60] Synodalbericht 1904, 57-8. Not all subscriptions were paid, but an anonymous giver, no doubt F. Schack once more, paid the last $329.75. Unpaid subscriptions were then written off, p. 63.

the entire cost exceeded $100,000,[61] income from lot sales covering little more than half of the total.[62]

The college at Clinton continued to follow the model of the German Gymnasium. Boys were admitted at confirmation age and if necessary assigned to a preparatory class. Above that level there were six classes with Latin names, Prima being the graduating class. Classical languages received strong emphasis throughout the course after the preparatory level. Equal stress was placed on German and English and on religious instruction. As a result social studies and natural sciences were slighted, only mathematics receiving considerable attention, while only an occasional course in other disciplines could be offered. Except in English and the sciences, German was the language of instruction. Completion of the course led to an A. B. degree. The college functioned primarily as a preparatory school for the seminary, but there were always students, who were preparing for secular professions, many of them did not complete the course. In the early years attempts were made to give business training, but these had to be abandoned.[63] After O. Kraushaar became president in 1899, suggestions for a broader program began to be heard. While the classical curriculum was designed primarily for training clergymen, surveys showed that the ministry attracted only a fraction of the youth of the synod which sought a higher education. To draw these into the college, the institution must conform to American educational patterns.[64] Such suggestions went unheeded during this period. A proposal in 1899 that co-education be introduced met hostility and a similar fate.[65]

---

[61] Synodalbericht 1902, 60, gives an accounting which lists construction costs as $90,099.36 and interest payments as $10,616.63.

[62] Ibid., total receipts from lot sales are given as $51,567.74. A little more may have come in from a settlement made with Mr. Seaman. He had guaranteed in 1893 to sell seventy-five lots in Clinton, but had sold only fifty, agreeing to take the rest himself. In the settlement he agreed to take ten lots for $3,000, paying in installments of which $499 was listed as still due. Total payments since 1896, when $50,242.90 had been reported as paid, were thus small. This was undoubtedly due to the total collapse of the real estate plan. Even as late as 1935 only a few lots had been occupied and only in the present period is the city of Clinton growing in the direction of the project, even yet a good many of the lots are used only for agricultural purposes. The buyers, therefore, could not realize upon their investment and no doubt this fact explains the hostility which met endeavors to pay the Clinton debt. Many of the lots were subsequently given to the college by deed or bequest or bought by it at delinquent tax sales, so that the college property eventually comprised most of the original tract.

---

[63] The business course was apparently instituted when the college moved to Clinton, it is mentioned, Synodalbericht 1896, 114-5. Three years later it was described as not very successful due to competition from better equipped and located business colleges, Synodalbericht 1899, 58. In 1902 it was recommended that this course be dropped unless adequate equipment for it could be supplied, Synodalbericht 1902, 63-4. No provision was made for equipment and the course died out. Need for library expansion and for more scientific apparatus was stressed in the sources cited. Some provision for such needs was made in 1904, Synodalbericht 1904, 63. Details on the curriculum can be found in college bulletins. Occasionally small initial enrollment and later withdrawals caused a class to drop out entirely, e. g., Synodalbericht 1902, 55.

[64] The subject was first mentioned in 1899. It was pointed out that many students from synodical circles did not attend the college. Attention was also called to rising professional standards and increasing utility of a college education in many walks of life, Synodalbericht 1899, 58-9. No suggestion for broadening the course was then made, probably because of the pressure of the debt. In 1902, however, the college report mentioned a circular sent out and replies which indicated broader needs. It was assumed that the college would serve only German-American circles, but as it was, it

The college had a staff of seven teachers, F. Richter serving as president until 1899 when he was succeeded by O. Kraushaar.[66] The enrollment generally stood between sixty and seventy and showed no marked indication of growth until the last two years of the period.[67] Student payments were

---

was serving only those in this group who were interested in the ministry. It should serve broader purposes and this would require conformity to the American pattern. *Synodalbericht 1902*, 65-7. In 1904 reference was made to increased enrollment, but nearly all students took the classical course. Were not others also needed? *Synodalbericht 1904*, 62.

[65] Kraushaar asked the synod to authorize co-education in 1899, as soon as finances should permit, *Synodalbericht 1899*, 59. Action was postponed. The motion had originally been presented in 1896, *K. B.* XLI, 1, 5-6, 9. Kraushaar discussed arguments pro and con in a series of articles which ran through 2, 15-16; 3, 26-7; 4, 38-9; 5, 54-5; 7, 88, concluding that it was needed. In 1900 a plan was under discussion to make private provision for housing and supervising girls in the vicinity of the college and for their admission to college classes, XLIII, 12, 146. The plan had to be dropped, because it disturbed opponents of co-education and endangered the debt appeal, 19, 241. The Western District heard a paper on the subject in 1900 which advocated separate girls' schools rather than co-education, *Synodalbericht Westl. Dist. 1900*, 15, 40-1.

[66] The older system of assigning a teacher to each class was abandoned and teachers were assigned subjects, *Synodalbericht 1896*, 112-13. At times when classes dropped out there were only six teachers, *Synodalbericht 1902*, 51-2.

[67] Enrollment in the first two years was sixty-six and sixty-nine with seven and three graduates, *Synodalbericht 1896*, 114. In the following triennium there were sixty-five, seventy-three, sixty-four students and seven, nine, no graduates, *Synodalbericht 1899*, 57. From 1899-1902 there were seventy-two, fifty-seven, sixty-three students and eight, eight, no graduates, *Synodalbericht 1902*, 55. In the last two years

increased, but there was much difficulty about collection.[68] In spite of this finances, aside from the building debt, were generally in sound condition, a deficit being incurred only in the first few years, although the college was hampered in acquiring needed teaching equipment.[69] Under Kraushaar's energetic leadership such needs were met in part at least through private gifts. A beginning was also made toward building up endowment and scholarship funds. After the building debt had been liquidated, plant improvements were undertaken and funds were raised for construction of a gymnasium.[70]

---

students numbered eighty-four and ninety-one and graduates six and four, Synodalbericht 1904, 52. Propaganda and Easter admissions accounted for the growth, pp. 61-2.

[68] Charges at Clinton were, tuition $40, room $15 and board $2 per week, for a total normally of $135 per year. Sons of pastors paid no tuition and reductions were granted on request, some students paying only $25, Synodalbericht 1896, 109. In 1899 the college reported efforts to counteract a general impression in the synod that anyone could be admitted for $25 per year, Synodalbericht 1899, 55.

[69] A deficit of $700 was reported Synodalbericht 1896, 118, but this was reduced and in 1899 a balance covered the remaining debt of $336, Synodalbericht 1899, 55.

[70] Synodalbericht 1899, 54; 1900, 56, mention acquisition of athletic equipment and campus improvements through such efforts. Synodalbericht 1902, 60-1; 1904, 58-60, report efforts to secure donations, regular annual contributions and also lots for funds. In 1904 the scholarship fund stood at $4,000.20, while the endowment fund had grown but little beyond the $1,358.65 reported two years earlier. For the gymnasium $1,061.55 plus outstanding subscriptions were on hand. The gas machine had been abandoned and gas mains laid and a residence for the janitor was projected. It may be mentioned that in the past, institutions had been controlled by faculties and that there was some friction in regard to presidential authority, which had been adjusted. Student discipline was still under the faculty and had also given trouble. Synodalbericht 1899, 55-60; 1902, 52-5, 73-4; 1904, 54-7.

The school left at Waverly in 1894 was to revert to the status of a teachers' seminary. It was in that year badly crippled through removal of most of the faculty and students and much of the equipment to Clinton, only two teachers and nine students remaining.[71] It proved to be difficult to maintain the school as a normal school only. The removal of the preparatory class to Clinton was a heavy handicap and though authority was soon given to establish such a class at Waverly, the normal school did not flourish. Both it and the preparatory class were maintained throughout the period, but they did not grow to proportions which justified maintenance of the institution.[72] Since the institution had before 1885 catered to local needs in addition to training teachers, efforts were immediately made to develop a department adapted to such ends. In 1894 an academy was set up, which functioned only in the winter months and offered both high school and business courses.[73] Private gifts subsidized this course until 1896 when the synod authorized its establishment as a regular department. It soon grew to much larger proportions than the normal department and continued for several years to serve its dual purpose, but in later years the business course was organized as a separate department and promptly far outstripped the academy in enrollment.[74] As already noted the synod also transferred the proseminary course to Waverly. Beginning in 1896 this preparatory course for older men was offered and

---

[71] Synodalbericht 1896, 121-2. Grossmann remained as president, but he had to resign for reasons of health and A. Engelbrecht was left alone until F. Lutz replaced Grossmann.

[72] In 1895 five of the nine students of the first year graduated and the normal school enrollment for the second year dropped to six, of whom one graduated in 1896. While the preparatory class at Clinton was to prepare students for both schools, the Waverly report in 1896 expressed doubts whether this arrangement would work and laid the decline in numbers to lack of such a class. The synod authorized establishment of a preparatory class in Waverly, provided that expenses did not exceed $300, Synodalbericht 1896, 121-3, 127. The class was thereafter carried as a separate department in the Waverly records. Enrollment in the next triennium was, normal seven, nine, ten, prep. four, two, eight, five teachers being graduated, three in the last year, one in each of the others. For the period 1899-1902 it was normal eleven, seven, seven with seven graduates in the first year and two in the last, prep. six, eight, six. In the last two years the normal course enrolled eight and four students, graduating four in the first year and none in the last and the preparatory department enrolled two and ten students, Synodalbericht 1899, 66-7; 1902, 77-8; 1904, 68. The maximum enrollment thus came in the year 1898-9 and stood at eighteen. The normal course remained at three years, in 1902 permission was received to extend the preparatory course to two years, Synodalbericht 1902, 76, 82. It may be added that at the same time employment of a music teacher was authorized, a pipe organ having been obtained through private

---

gifts, p. 75. Though probably planned in connection with normal work, this was to become a separate department and in 1902 twelve music students were separately listed, Synodalbericht 1904, 68.

[73] During the first year both day and evening courses were given, eight students enrolling for each. In the second year day courses only were offered from October until March and the enrollment numbered eighteen. The course was planned for two years, but only six students carried over and only two graduated with commercial certificates. Although a separate teacher was engaged, the course ran no deficit during the first year, but lacked $50 to meet expenses during the second, Synodalbericht 1896, 123-6.

[74] In the following triennium academy enrollment was given as twenty, thirty-seven, thirty-two, with one, five, four graduates. For 1899-1902 academy enrollment was ten, twenty-six, sixteen, with one, no, one graduates, but the business department was then listed separately. In the last two years academy enrollment declined to fifteen and ten, no graduates being recorded. In the previous triennium the business course had twenty-seven, twenty-six, thirty-eight students with one, four, five graduates and in the last two

drew a small additional number of students, the enrollment usually running slightly higher than that of the normal department.[75] The school at Waverly thus came to serve a variety of purposes, training men as teachers and preparing others for the seminary and offering still other types of training for the laity. In the academy co-education was introduced and the beginnings of a special music department were also laid.[76]

---

years forty-eight and forty-three students with eight and twelve graduates, Synodalbericht 1899, 66-7; 1902, 77-8; 1904, 68. These courses were now given throughout the year, the duration of the business course apparently remaining two years, while that of the academy had been extended to three by 1902. The business course was listed a sub-department of the academy, Synodalbericht 1902, 74, 76.

[75] For the first triennium there were four, twelve, eleven students, two and seven graduates in the last two years. In the years 1899-1902 the figures were nine, seven, eight with one, one, one graduates. In the last two years there were six and ten students with four graduates in the former year. See sources cited in preceding footnote. In 1904 it was reported that this course had also been extended to three years, Synodalbericht 1904, 66.

[76] See footnote 72 for music, co-education was mentioned K. B. XLI, 7, 88. The convention of 1904 asked the school to stress teacher training, calling attention to the fact that it was losing its original character and was likely to lose synodical interest, because of failure to meet synodical needs. This judgment seems somewhat harsh, but undoubtedly much of the work offered at Waverly served primarily its local community. It was driven to this development by the failure of the normal course to attract students. In the first two years its total enrollment had stood at twenty-five and twenty-four and even then two-thirds were local academy students. As this work was expanded the total grew in the next triennium to thirty-five, sixty, sixty-one. From 1899-1902 this level was maintained with sixty-two, sixty and sixty-nine students and in the last two years the totals were eighty-three and eighty-one.

With the expansion of courses the teaching staff at Waverly was gradually increased to five.[77] In the early years, when the resident enrollment was very small, the students were boarded with private families, later the dining hall was again placed in operation, but under private management.[78] Despite such economies, the school operated with a deficit during most of the period.[79] As the enrollment increased needs for expansion and improvement of plant made themselves felt. After 1900 a residence for the president was built, but requests for additional residences and for a dormitory could not be granted.[80]

---

[77] *Synodalbericht 1902*, 76, the music teacher was the fifth teacher.

[78] *Synodalbericht 1899*, 64.

[79] *Synodalbericht 1896*, 126, showed a deficit of $430.83, plus $50 for the academy, that for 1899, 70, showed that the deficit had increased to $1,681.75, that for 1902, 79, showed the debt paid and a small balance, but that for 1904 again showed a debt of $1,774.85, p. 69, though about $250 was in the treasury.

[80] A vote of the districts of the synod rather narrowly approved of building the house, entirely on borrowed funds, so that a debt of more than $2,400 was incurred. In 1902 the institution had no other debt and the synod rather grudgingly remitted $2,044 which had been borrowed from the *Synodicalkasse* which had a sizable surplus, *Synodalbericht 1902*, 81, 37. The rest had been advanced by the institution itself from operating funds, the *Synodalkasse*, having made it an earlier grant of $500. No action was taken when the institution reported at the same time that two additional residences were needed. A dormitory was suggested by the board of regents in 1904, probably for girls, but no action was taken and a request for central heating in the main building was denied, because of the debt of the institution, *Synodalbericht 1904*, 67, 70.

Following the model of Clinton, the board of regents was reorganized and the institution received a constitution in 1904.[81]

In 1896 the Texas Synod entered into organic union with the Iowa Synod. This body had established a college at Brenham in 1891, which it was permitted to keep under the terms of union, being responsible for its maintenance, the general synod assuming no obligations, but exercising general supervision.[82] The college carried a large debt and its support soon became a heavy burden for the Texas District, which, however, held its existence to be vital and did not wish to give it up. Several northern pastors were called as teachers and in 1901 a special offering throughout the synod for this college was announced.[83] In 1902 the district asked the synod to take the college over. The synod did not agree to do this, but it gave the district permission to take up a special appeal throughout the synod to clear its interest-bearing debt of $3,000. This amount was raised during the next biennium and in 1904 the synod resolved to grant the college an annual subsidy of $2,000.[84]

---

[81] Synodalbericht 1902, 75-6, 82; 1904, 64-70.

[82] Synodalbericht 1896, 34-5.

[83] K. B. XLIV, 1, 9, announced the offering, because drouth and flood had afflicted Texas and the college was unable to pay its staff. Romberg, Haefner, Schaefer were northern men serving there at the time. These difficulties and discord at the institution were discussed at the district convention in 1901 which resolved that the college must be maintained, 8, 97-8.

During the second twenty-five years of the Iowa Synod its system of higher education thus experienced considerable development. The seminary was definitely set up as a separate institution, divorced from all preparatory work. It received an adequate home and largely escaped from the financial difficulties which had beset its earlier days. While its curriculum was not greatly altered, its staff was expanded. Its enrollment, however, tended to decline, because it no longer drew large numbers of German students and because its preparatory schools could not furnish a capacity enrollment. The college could not be adequately developed while it was combined with other institutions. It was finally furnished with the finest plant possessed by the synod and this was made debt free. But the college was developed exclusively along the lines originally marked out for it and thus had no great appeal for American youth. This was beginning to be understood toward the close of the period, but no changes were made. Its development was, therefore, more or less disappointing and it could not furnish all the men needed by the seminary. The teachers' seminary did not flourish, largely because there was no adequate demand and no attractive emolument for its graduates. The institution at Waverly, however, branched out in other directions and strove to serve the needs of the laity of the synod. In this respect it achieved a considerable degree of success, but it served primarily its local constituency. The college at Brenham was as yet in an early stage of development and involved in a struggle to become firmly established amidst a constituency which needed its services, but was unable to furnish adequate support.

---

[84] *K*. *B*. XLV, 19, 220, reports the action in general terms, reasons for refusal to take the college over were not stated, but later it was stated that legal reasons interfered.. Originally the synod no doubt had not wished to do so, because it was then confronted with the Clinton debt, but by 1902 that had been cleared. Prof. Romberg was appointed collector and given a year's leave of absence for the purpose, 21, 257. Remittances of $937 and $2,503.43 were reported *K*. *B*. XLVI, 6, 74, and XLVII, 7, 89. The debt was not entirely cleared, however, XLVII, 19, 250, reported that Brenham debts now stood at $7,000 which according to the earlier announcement may not have been interest-bearing. The subsidy together with a statement that the college could not be taken over for legal reasons is reported, *Synodalbericht 1904*, 187.

The seminary was the chief source of manpower for the synod during this period, usually graduating ten to fifteen candidates each year. Neuendettelsau also continued to send candidates, but their number declined in the later years. Not only had this school already begun to send pastors to Australia in the preceding period, but it established a foreign mission in New Guinea not long after Germany acquired a colony there in 1886. It also supplied the seminary with students, but their number too declined in the later years. The relations with Melsungen came to an end in the later seventies.

Luebtheen continued to send students through most of the period, though also in diminishing numbers, but did not furnish pastors. Some students continued to come from Hesse through Pastor Schedler and Pastor Dietrich who carried on after his death, but when the latter also died this school was closed. Another school was opened at Strackholt in Ostfriesland under Pastor Janssen, which sent students, but not pastors after 1890. Students occasionally also came from seminaries at Leipzig and at Breklum.[85] In the main German sources thus sent students rather than pastors, and the number of students declined in the later years, reducing the enrollment at the seminary. In the earlier years, however, their number had been large enough to supply abundant manpower, so that the synod experienced its greatest sustained rate of growth during this period. In 1904 the clerical roster listed 473 pastors and professors, of whom 459 were in active service.[86]

---

[85] The seminary reports in the various synodical reports may be consulted for details on German students, their origins, and on closed relationships. Strackholt was first mentioned in Synodalbericht 1890, 42. Luebtheen apparently ceased to prepare students by 1904, for a representative of the Gotteskasten who attended the anniversary convention reported an arrangement under which the organization would give financial support to students at Strackholt, which would provide training for groups of ten to twelve students, and might make similar arrangements with other German schools. Two German representatives were present, who were asked to direct qualified German students to the seminary, Synodalbericht 1904, 113. S. Fritschel had visited Germany for a fourth time in 1891, to attend an anniversary celebration at Neuendettelsau and had attempted without success to secure a German theologian as professor for the seminary, Synodalbericht 1893, 13, 83. He had probably also visited Strackholt with which relationships were just being established at that time and may have been at the other institutions which subsequently supplied some students.

So great an increase in manpower made possible a great expansion of missionary endeavor. The Reisepredigermission was given a definite organization in 1882. A committee was created which was to serve as a board of home missions. It was authorized to call permanent Reiseprediger or to engage pastors on leave from their congregations for limited periods, to assign them areas of work, supervise and if necessary dismiss them, and to pay them salaries and travel expenses. Such men were to travel over wider areas, gather congregations and serve them until they could call their own pastors. Congregations as a rule were responsible for supporting pastors when they were called, but if necessary the board might grant subsidies. Pastors so stationed in mission areas, were to do further mission work in all directions and reserve a certain number of Sundays for such work. Groups too small to support pastors were to be served in this way or on weekdays if necessary, especially if they were so located as to give reasonable hope for growth. The board was to obtain information from pastors in settled areas as to people moving westward and their location and was also to exchange information in regard to settlements with Swedish and Norwegian synods. Conferences in mission areas were to make location of mission fields a standing topic on their agenda, while those in settled areas were to keep informed about newly arriving immigrants and to forward such information to the board.[87]

---

[86] Although most of the oldest pastors of the synod died or retired during this period, numbers had been so small during the first ten to fifteen years that losses from this cause were not yet extraordinarily heavy. Withdrawals occurred, but not in great numbers. The rate of growth was therefore high, since losses did not nearly balance accessions. Considerable numbers of pastors were also received into membership from other sources. The writer has been unable to study this aspect thoroughly, but he calculates that roughly fifty to seventy-five pastors cannot be accounted for through seminary graduations and most therefore have come from Neuendettelsau and from other sources. The figures for 1904 included 455 pastors, four assistants and fourteen emeriti, Synodalbericht 1904, 156. Numbers for earlier years to be found in the respective synodical reports were, 1885, 196; 1893, 300; 1899, 402.

Financing the missions received attention in 1885. Annual mission festivals had become common by then and their proceeds had largely been going toward foreign missions. In future at least half of these were to be designated for home missions. Mission study groups, which also had been giving support to foreign missions, were to seek to increase interest in home missions. Wherever it could be done mission societies with regular dues were to be organized. Offering boxes for missions were to be placed in all churches and endeavors were to be made to interest youth and to institute special offerings in Christenlehren, Sunday Schools and parochial schools. It may be noted that Neuendettelsau, which had originally promised support for two years, was still making contributions.[88]

---

[87] Synodalbericht 1882, 12-14. The board consisted of three members who might coopt two more. The original members were G. Fritschel, Wilke, C. Proehl. Reiseprediger might be dismissed for incapacity or for failure to make reports. They were to receive a salary, but in return were to pay all offerings as well as perquisites into the treasury. Pastors stationed in missionary areas, however, were not to receive pay for mandatory missionary work. The board was also in charge of all publicity.

This system was maintained for more than a decade. Finances tended to give trouble, particularly in the period of drouth and hard times in the west in the late eighties and early nineties, which made it necessary to give much more aid to mission congregations than had been contemplated.[89]

---

[88] These regulations followed recommendations by the board. Efforts had already been made to introduce special Lenten offerings in Sunday Schools, the convention broadened their scope. The board had noted that mission study groups had raised about $1,500 annually for foreign missions and suggested that half of this be allocated to home missions, on this point the synodical resolution was vague. The board had already ordered offering boxes and had suggested annual dues of $.50 or $1.00 for mission societies. The convention also instituted the custom of holding mission festivals in connection with all synodical conventions. Neuendettelsau paid the salary of one Reiseprediger each year and was entitled to first publication of his reports, Synodalbericht 1885, 15, 20-1, 25.

[89] The board alluded to the necessity of support for new missions as early as 1885. It insisted on self-support wherever possible, in order not to coddle congregations, but in new areas poor crops and low farm prices often made some support necessary. Congregations which would attract new settlers must be held. The convention approved such aid, even if it should involve abandonment of unpromising missions and made the financial provisions already noted, Synodalbericht 1885, 18-20, 24. It was, of course, true that funds spent

In time the functions of the central board tended to interfere with district functions to some extent. In 1896 the district synods were authorized to set up district mission committees. They were to work under the supervision of the central board which handled the finances, while district presidents were to handle all church governmental functions.[90]

---

for support for congregations limited those available for Reiseprediger. In 1896 the board reported a deficit of $2,400 despite a good income, because hard times had delayed maturity of promising missions and even thrown congregations which had become self-supporting back on mission support. During the triennium forty-six parishes had received support against thirty in the preceding period. Existing fields had been held, but little expansion had been possible, Synodalbericht 1896, 60-2. In 1899 the deficit had been reduced to $1,800 which was covered by the convention from the Synodalkasse three years later. The board reported that its income had amounted to $22,345, but this came to little more than $7,000 per year, whereas $10,000 was now needed annually, Synodalbericht 1899, 77-8; 1902, 36. Reports in the intervening years had mentioned the hard times and needs occasioned by them, but no deficits were then incurred. The remission in 1902 covered only loans owed to the Synodalkasse, the total debt in that year was reported as $2,825. A mission fund, amounting by then to $2,725, had been established from which the rest had been borrowed, Synodalbericht 1902, 95, 98-9. No mention of the debt was made in 1904, income for the biennium was given at more than $25,000, Synodalbericht 1904, 82. The method of raising funds was not altered, several conventions after 1885 confirmed it and emphasized neglected methods.

[90] It will be remembered that in the original plan the conferences had been instructed to survey mission opportunities. In 1888 they had been asked to induce capable members to serve as Reiseprediger on leave, reporting to district presidents. This and calls may have caused some friction. Relief for the central committee may also have been a factor, for also in 1888 this board was authorized to appoint subcommittees in mission areas and the Ausschuss was instructed to regulate their relations to district presidents, Synodalbericht 1888, 26. District mission committees had been considered in 1893, but not authorized, Synodalbericht 1893, 63. The arrangement of 1896 provided for district committees consisting of district presidents and two other members, the central board was to

The central committee reported in 1899 that this system did not work well. The district committees acted on their own initiative and merely applied for funds, the board could not supervise when it often did not know what was happening. The convention adopted a new organization under which the district synods assumed responsibility for home missions. The district committees were to make plans and supervise their execution, reporting to their district synods to which they were responsible, but also to the central board to provide statistical and financial information. The central board was to make a division of funds, to provide general publicity and give advice on request and to report to general conventions.[91] This organization worked well and was thereafter in effect.

Especially in the earlier years, before support of mission congregations became an established practice, the method used was that of sending a Reiseprediger into a rapidly growing area. As he found locations which appeared promising, he organized congregations which then sent calls usually to candidates. Means to support Reiseprediger remained limited, however, and the life of such a missionary was strenuous, so that it usually was not long before a

---

divide funds in consultation with them and district presidents were to handle calls, Synodalbericht 1896, 91.

[91] Synodalbericht 1899, 79-80, 98-9, 119-21. A mission district in Washington and adjacent states was left directly under the supervision of the central board, since no district synod existed in that area.

Reiseprediger accepted a call. Consequently the board often used men for short periods of travel, rather than to issue permanent calls. Even when it did so, it usually had to replace them after brief periods of service. In the later years, when means were more adequate, the management had been transferred to the district synods, so employment of Reiseprediger would have devolved upon them. Although the central board recommended that they do so, the districts used this method only occasionally. By then a new pattern had gradually developed, under which promising mission fields received subsidies, which enabled them to maintain pastors until they could become self-supporting. Such fields in the newer areas were often extensive and many were subsequently subdivided into several parishes. The disappearance of the frontier was no doubt a factor in this development, but as long as much migration continued to move into relatively new territories, opportunities for Reiseprediger missions existed and the central board suggested this method to the districts as late as 1902.[92]

In the decade after 1879 the synod concentrated a great deal of missionary effort in Dakota Territory, where no foothold had been gained before the twenty-fifth anniversary. Early in the period a beginning was made by Pastor Bischoff at

---

[92] For details see the reports of the central board in the synodical reports, 1885-1904, and those of the district committee in the district convention reports, 1897-1904.

Scotland in South Dakota, which led to organization of congregations in numerous locations in the southeast. _Reiseprediger_ were sent in and soon organized congregations to the northward, in eastern South Dakota, moving as far westward as the Missouri River in several areas. Eastern North Dakota was likewise visited and footholds were gained in the Red River Valley, extending along the eastern edge as far northward as Grand Forks and reaching over into Northern Minnesota. While not all positions could be maintained permanently, a good many sound foundations were laid. Without counting self-supporting congregations, the mission board by 1888 reported fourteen missions in Dakota, most of which ranged over several counties and served as many as six different groups. By 1890 _Reiseprediger_ were visiting the Black Hills region and before long missions were extending into the interior of North Dakota also. In 1890 a separate Dakota District was organized and missionary endeavor was continued in both states throughout the period.[93]

By 1890 a _Reiseprediger_ had been sent to the west coast and had established a mission at Seattle and reported promising opportunities in Washington. The convention of that year resolved that mission work in this area was to be pursued energetically, so that a conference might be established, which was to be associated with the Dakota District for the time being. Working mainly in western Washington, missions were also established in Oregon and several parishes reached over into British Columbia. Attempts to gain footholds in eastern Washington were not successful, but a mission in Idaho took root. By 1896 four pastors were serving in this field reaching thirteen nuclei as well as several preaching stations. By 1902 seven pastors were serving ten parishes. The work was difficult, however, and even more difficult to supervise. In 1896 this area was constituted as a mission district directly under the supervision of the central mission board, but though organization as an independent district was contemplated, conditions were too unstable and this step could not be taken during the period.[94]

---

[93] _Ibid_.

The synod had gained a foothold in Nebraska before 1879. When the old unwieldly Western District was divided in 1880 a new district under that name comprised the congregations in Nebraska, southwestern Iowa and central and western Missouri, as well as the new missions in Kansas. In this district, also, especially in Nebraska and Kansas, concentrated missionary endeavors were carried on. Reiseprediger were employed here also. They followed mainly along the lines indicated by the travels of the earlier period. The strongest concentration of congregations came into existence in southeastern Nebraska from the river westward to Thayer County. Beyond that there was an outpost or two in the Republican Valley. Farther north a number of congregations were established in the Platte Valley in central and western Nebraska. In the north a new line was established centering in Cedar County and then extended westward to Creighton and southward to Albion. Reiseprediger were also sent into Colorado and Wyoming, accomplishing little in the latter, but establishing a number of congregations in the former state. In Kansas the fields located in the late seventies in the north central area were developed and extended toward the western boundary. A number of congregations also came into existence in the central part of the state and were also extended toward the westward. Reiseprediger moved on into Oklahoma and established a few fields there and one mission was also developed in Arkansas. In Missouri there was small effort to found new missions, though the existing congregations were developed. By 1890 the synod had forty-nine pastors in the entire Western District, by 1904 there were sixty-eight.[95]

---

[94] Synodalbericht 1890, 29-30, 35, deals with the origins of this mission, subsequent reports give details. One difficulty was the lack of older and experienced men in the area. Efforts to send older pastors there met with little success, though E. Knappe was long stationed at Seattle.

While energetic efforts were thus made to establish missions in the newer territories of the west, steady growth was experienced in areas where the synod had worked for many years. The central mission board placed the chief emphasis on the new territories, but it also gave support to missions in such states as Iowa and Wisconsin. When the district mission committees took charge, missions were reported in all districts.

---

[95] See the mission reports in synodical reports, 1882-1904, and the reports of conventions of the Western District for the same years.

By 1885 the synod, which had in the past concentrated chiefly upon rural areas, became interested in city missions. The Eastern District pointed the way with a mission in Detroit which received financial support from the central board. Other city missions were established in Chicago, Omaha, and Minneapolis and in such smaller cities as Oshkosh, Wisconsin; Des Moines and Ottumwa, Iowa. Not all of these missions were successful, but particularly in Minneapolis and St. Paul a number of flourishing congregations were established.[96]

A city mission of a particular type was undertaken by the synod in 1894 when a Jewish mission was established in Chicago. Inquiries from a proselyte in that city had aroused considerable interest and when a circular letter to pastors elicited promises of support, the work was provisionally undertaken. The availability of Pastor E. H. Heimann, a member who was himself a proselyte, made it possible to begin without delay.[97] Heimann faced many difficulties, some of them of a financial nature, but with support from outside sources, these were met[98] and by 1896 he was able to report a promising beginning and six baptisms.[99] The convention of 1896 approved the undertaking and confirmed the arrangements.[100] The mission was carried on during the next three years amidst various difficulties, eleven additional baptisms being recorded. By 1899 there was considerable criticism of the conduct of the missionary and the lack of greater results, but the synod

---

[96] *Synodalbericht* *1885*, 22; 1888, 20-22, deal with the first city missions and the latter, pp. 17-18, reports on a number of rural missions in older areas. Later synodical reports and those of the districts after 1896 supply details.

[97] The proselyte in Chicago had formerly attended Wartburg Seminary and was then at Chicago Lutheran seminary preparing himself for such a mission. He called attention of synodical officers to favorable conditions in Chicago in 1893. Several pastors were consulted and before long two conferences proposed that the work be undertaken and called attention to the availability of Heimann. To avoid excessive costs a subcommittee of the *Ausschuss* was rather irregularly established. It decided to send out a circular to pastors asking support and instructed Deindoerfer to name a committee to take charge and to make a provisional beginning, pending approval by the next convention, if they should react favorably. After about $700 had been pledged, Heimann was called

---

at a salary of $1,000 and given appropriate instructions. He began his work early in 1894, *Synodalbericht* *1896*, 23-5.

[98] Voluntary contributions provided the support which the synod furnished and ran from a low of $1,034.80 in 1894 to a high of $1,826.99 in 1901, *Synodalbericht* *1896*, 43; *1902*, 30, and averaged perhaps $1,400. They did little more, therefore, than pay the salary. An initial difficulty was securing quarters. A local society was organized which raised funds for this and other purposes successfully, but its financial accountings were not rendered to the synod. *Synodalbericht* *1896*, 93-4, describes these problems and their solutions. The General Council recommended the mission to its congregations and aid was also given from Swedish and Norwegian sources, pp. 97-8. In the reports for 1896 and 1899 receipts from other sources are given for several years, ranging from $170.98 to $1,000.49. The rise was due to the delegation of a Swedish pastor to raise funds, whose expenses, however, consumed a large part of them.

[99] Heimann had to deal with different Jewish groups, finding wealthy Reform Jews responsive, but unreceptive. He also met hostility. His report implies that he might have had more baptisms, but that he was conservative in this respect. The report gives an interesting account of the nature of the work and the methods pursued, *Synodalbericht* *1896*, 95-6.

[100] *Ibid.*, 100-1.

made no move toward discontinuing the work.[101] In 1901 Pastor G. Sandrock was called as second missionary. Heimann seems to have resented this call and raised objections to instructions regulating relationships between the two missionaries, which led to a quarrel with the committee in charge and to his dismissal. Heimann appealed to the president, who appointed a committee to investigate which regretfully upheld the dismissal, whereupon Heimann attempted to appeal to the convention of 1902.[102] The convention ordered another investigation and resolved to discontinue the mission.[103]

---

[101] Heimann's report described his work in detail and indicated that only a small percentage of those instructed, received baptism or were still under instruction. It also pointed out that proselytes were generally rejected by Jews, but not readily accepted by Christians. The tone of the committee report was defensive and makes it obvious that there was criticism of lack of results, particularly because Heimann gave part of his time to a teaching position and also because his salary had been increased under these circumstances (by $100). Personal charges of an unspecified nature had also been raised against him. The committee strongly emphasized the difficulties of the work. The convention resolved to devote a Sunday each year to presentation of the work, to ask the missionary to give his full time to the work and to fix his salary by synodical action in the future, Synodalbericht 1899, 123-31.

[102] Synodalbericht 1902, 14-15. See also Deindoerfer, Synode von Iowa, 1854-1904, Chicago, 1904, for a brief account of the Jewish mission on pp. 18-20 and K. B. XLV, 19, 228. Deindoerfer specifically asked the convention not to discontinue the mission over this incident. He had rejected an appeal by Heimann to the convention on the ground that it contained unfounded charges. It may be noted that a little earlier the Southern District had resolved to ask the synod to place the mission under intersynodical management, K. B. XLIV, 23.

[103] Synodalbericht 1902, 108. Heimann and the committee each were to select three members of a committee of investigation with a neutral head to settle the complaint. If the dismissal were found unjustified Heimann's salary was to be paid

Deindoerfer subsequently interpreted the result of the investigation as justifying dismissal and Heimann appealed to the convention of 1904, which upheld the president.[104] This missionary undertaking therefore was short-lived, led to no great results and ended with an unfortunate quarrel.[105]

In 1896 the synod acquired an extensive mission field in the southwest when the Texas Synod was organically united with it. This synod had existed since 1851 and had been a member of the General Council for many years. It drew pastors from the mission institute St. Chrischona in Basel, but not in sufficient numbers to grow into a large body and to be able adequately to deal with missionary opportunities among the

---

up to the time of discontinuance, Sandrock's was to be paid until he secured a new position. The motion to discontinue carried by a vote of 42-29.

[104] Synodalbericht 1904, 15, 21-22. Heimann demanded his salary, Deindoerfer refused to authorize payment on the ground that the investigation had explicitly found the dismissal justified. A floor committee took no action on Heimann's appeal, but one member brought in a minority report apparently in his favor which the convention tabled. Two pastors then entered a statement on the minutes, declaring the refusal to pay, a wrong to Heimann. The convention responded with a resolution which stated that the refusal did not reflect on Heimann's moral character, which the investigation had cleared.

[105] Heimann seems to have had an unfortunate personality. Apparently he resented Sandrock's call, because it had in part been based on his own frequent absences from Chicago in the interest of the mission. The local committee and other supporters took steps to carry on the mission and to retain Heimann, K. B. XLV, 19, 22. See also 20, 243, and 21, 256. Synodalbericht 1904, 27, reports receipts for the mission for 1902 and 1903, relatively small sums which may have gone toward Sandrock's salary.

large German population of Texas. The synod had no seminary and was meeting grave difficulty in supporting a college, which had only recently been founded. The General Council did not maintain a seminary as such and the seminaries of its member synods did not serve the needs of Texas. Reluctantly therefore the synod came to the conclusion that it was necessary to give up its independence and to join a larger body, from which the necessary assistance might be derived. In 1893 Iowa was approached and its willingness to enter into negotiations ascertained. Though a preliminary vote had unfavorable results, the Texas Synod at its convention in 1894 expressed a desire to be admitted into the Iowa Synod as a district synod.[106]

---

[106] Verhandlungen der 42. Versammlung der Ersten Deutschen Evang.-Lutherischen Synode in Texas 5, 8-9, 13-14; (this source will hereafter be cited as Verh. Texas Syn. with the appropriate number) Synodalbericht 1896, 18-19. It will be remembered that Texas had applied to Iowa for men at an earlier time. At that time G. J. Fritschel was teaching at the college in Brenham. President Stricker had opened negotiations by writing to Deindoerfer and inquiring whether Iowa would consider a closer connection with Texas and whether it could supply men for Texas missions. Deindoerfer had replied that if agreement in regard to the confessions and practice existed, Iowa would be ready to enter into a mutually desirable connection. Arrangements for use of Iowa's schools and supply of missionaries would depend on the kind of connection desired by Texas. Deindoerfer had also offered to send a representative to Texas for oral negotiation. He had consulted the Ausschuss before making this reply. Texas thereupon took a vote of its members which resulted in a majority for an organic union, but not in the extraordinary majority required by the Texas constitution for such action. A few months later, however, at its annual convention Texas resolved with appropriate regrets to sever its connection with the General Council and then carried a second resolution requesting membership in Iowa as a district synod, also selecting a committee to conduct negotiations toward this end. Texas expressed a desire to retain its charter, constitution and name, as well as its church paper, its college and

When Iowa was informed of this action, the Ausschuss delegated S. Fritschel to conduct negotiations in Texas and instructed him as to conditions. The primary condition was full agreement on confessional position and in regard to practice, especially with respect to discipline, secret societies and altar and pulpit fellowship. Texas would also have to sever official relationships with St. Chrischona or any other institutions with unionist practices and if pastors were sent from such sources they would be required to attend the seminary for a time. Texas must thirdly accept Iowa's constitution as part of the synod and bring its own into complete harmony with it and accept the same status as a district as all others. It might retain its mission committee, but would have to subordinate it to the central board. It might retain its college and its organ, but subject to synodical supervision. Texas would also have to assume the duty of supporting all synodical treasuries and causes, but agreement might be reached in regard to ways and means. Admission of pastors from outside sources would be governed by Iowa's constitution, but if necessary a permanent commission to conduct colloquys might be established.[107]

S. Fritschel went to Texas in the summer of 1894 and succeeded in reaching agreement on these terms with the com-

---

its own district mission committee. The latter point may have been a factor in the establishment of district mission committees by Iowa in 1896 when the union was consummated.

[107] Synodalbericht 1896, 19-20.

mittee in charge. In the next year the agreement was submitted to the convention of the Texas Synod. A good deal of opposition arose particularly in regard to severance of relations with St. Chrischona. With some difficulty, however, the necessary majority was obtained and Texas then made official application for membership in Iowa.[108] While no action could be taken on the application until the next general convention should meet, several pastors went to Texas and joined the synod there in the meantime. To the convention of 1896 Deindoerfer strongly recommended admission of Texas as a separate district. The convention took note of full agreement in regard to confessions and practice and of severance of ties with St. Chrischona and resolved to comply. The district was permitted to retain its name, charter and constitution, as well as its organ, both to come under synodical supervision, and also its own system of raising offerings.[109]

Through admission of the Texas Synod, a new and extensive mission field was added, with some thirty pastors, some forty congregations and some 2,000 communicant members. The

---

[108] *Verh*. *Texas* *Synod* *43*. 7, 9-10, 16-17, 18-21. Most St. Chrischona men were indignant, but it was explained that no slight or ingratitude was intended. In the vote there were forty-one ayes, one nay and nineteen not voting, many of those who abstained, doing so in order to prevent a schism. St. Chrischona gave evidence of resentment at a later time, *Verh*. *Texas* *Syn*. *45*, 9, 11.

[109] *Synodalbericht* *1896*, 21-3; 33-5. Texas was to be responsible for support of the college, which it apparently wished to retain as a district institution only until it was free of debt. Two delegates from Texas were present.

Texas Synod had been a little larger, but a number of pastors and congregations withdrew from it in disapproval.[110] Since the seminary was no longer furnishing as many graduates as in earlier days and mission opportunities abounded in other districts, the synod was not able to pour unlimited manpower into Texas, but its missions thereafter received their share of available candidates. By 1904 the clerical roster contained fifty-one names.[111] The southwest was henceforth to be an important area of missionary endeavors though it was but tenuously connected with the northern area of synodical activities through a thin string of congregations in Missouri, Kansas and Oklahoma. It may be noted that through a mission in Mississippi another foothold was secured in the older south, but like earlier endeavors in this area, it was not held long.[112]

---

[110] The Texas Synod had forty pastors in 1896, Verh. Texas Syn. 44, 44, but according to 45, 9, six of them withdrew. Four or five of the thirty-four remaining pastors had previously been members of the Iowa Synod and were merely regained. The former report lists forty-six congregations and gives the number of communicants in thirty-five of them as 2,095, pp. 45, 46. The withdrawn pastors took their congregations with them, but some of them returned subsequently. It may be noted that several other congregations had withdrawn in protest earlier.

[111] Verh. Texas Syn. 52, 37-8. Two of the pastors were out of service. It may be noted that since the Texas Synod was older than Iowa deaths and retirements occurred regularly and many replacements were needed.

[112] The mission in Mississippi was mentioned without details in Synodalbericht 1899, 91, but no further references to it were made. Mention may also be made of a few attempts to serve other foreign language groups. In Illinois a Slovak group was given a pastor who spoke that language and a French settlement was given similar service, while contacts were made with another French group in Iowa. A pastor was also sought for a Czech settlement in South Dakota, but there is no further record on this case, Synodalbericht 1888, 22.

In the nineties the synod was for a time considering a mission in Brazil. The Gotteskasten in Germany asked the synod to supply a man to work among German immigrants in South America at German expense. When the synod took an interest in the project, it was asked to furnish one or more pastors and to assume direction of the work. The Ausschuss found several men who were willing to go to Brazil and worked out a project under which a committee was to take charge, responsible both to the synod and to the Gotteskasten and even offered financial aid. Two of the pastors concerned withdrew, however, and the third was prevented from accepting a call by changed circumstances. While endeavors were under way to find another missionary, the convention of 1896 gave its approval to the plan. When, however, a man was found at last outside of the synod, new arrangements were made for direction of the mission from Germany. The mission proceeded, but the synod had nothing to do with it.[113]

Synodical expansion implied a steady growth in the number of individuals served by the synod. Statistical reports show that this number grew somewhat faster proportionally than that of clergymen in service. In 1884 196 pastors were serving 337 congregations, of which only 160 were synodical, with 27,191 communicant members and 47,264 souls. In 1893 the synod had 300 pastors and thirty-one teachers, 494 congregations as well as 305 additional preaching stations, communicants numbered 50,283 and souls 87,979. By 1898 the number of pastors had grown to 402 of whom seven were in retirement and there were thirty-four teachers. There were 333 synodical and 318 non-synodical congregations and 173 preaching stations, while the number of communicants had risen to 74,058 and that of souls to 129,021. The statistics for 1903 published in the following anniversary year showed 473 pastors, fourteen of whom had retired, 869 congregations, slightly more than half of the number being synodical, and 141 preaching stations. There were 27,072 voting members, 90,598 communicants and 154,636 souls.[114]

---

[113] Synodalbericht 1896, 26-8, 35; 1899, 21. These endeavors occurred between 1895 and 1897. The purpose was to organize a Lutheran synod in Brazil which would eventually become independent. Pastors Reu, Bergstraesser and Sandrock volunteered and the first was asked to go to explore the possibilities and was later to be followed by another. Reu had, however, lost interest because of unfavorable reports in regard to numbers of Germans in Brazil. Though he was ready to abide by his promise, the committee passed him over and met the same response from Bergstraesser. Sandrock had just accepted another call. The committee in charge finally secured Pastor Kuhr from the New York Ministerium in the General Council, but he went to Germany and made arrangements there which caused the committee to become inactive.

The synod did not revise its standards of practice in order to gain in numbers. The conditions laid down during the negotiations with the Texas Synod indicate that a sound and conservative practice was still a synodical characteristic. Supervision of course became more difficult as the synod grew larger, but the district synod and the appointment of special visitors were designed to maintain it. Intervals between visitations, however, tended to grow longer as busy pastors could not frequently be absent from their own charges and perhaps it was somewhat easier for those not anxious to be visited to put off a neighbor than a prominent synodical official. Formal discipline cases occurred only rarely thus continuing the trend of the previous period with its substitution of pastoral care. The synod continued to oppose secret societies and in most rural areas continued to be largely successful in excluding their members, in the cities admonition and instruction often supplanted exclusion.

---

[114] Synodalbericht 1885, 50; 1892, 117; 1899, 180-1; 1904, 156. The first of these reports indicates that fifteen pastors had not sent parochial reports. While the later reports are silent on the number of reports it is probable that they also are based on incomplete data. The proportional gain in members over pastors thus would probably be somewhat higher still.

Parochial schools continued to be emphasized strongly. The normal school at Waverly provided at least a small supply of teachers and thus furnished relief for pastors in strong congregations, while elsewhere pastors continued to teach. In 1888 a model constitution for schools was adopted and recommended to congregations. It provided for instruction throughout the year, except for specified vacation periods, and for compulsory attendance of all children of the congregation between the ages of six to seven and thirteen to fourteen. Instruction was regularly to be given in religious subjects, German, English, writing, arithmetic, geography, history, science, drawing and singing. Discipline was to be maintained and a final examination given publicly at the end of each year. There were regulations for calling and dismissing teachers and for their resignation and for remuneration through tuition fees and congregational contributions. Each school was to be under the supervision of a school board which was responsible for selection of textbooks, revision of rules and curriculum, acquisition of equipment and was to attend examinations and act on all kinds of complaints.[115] In 1890 a central school board was established which was to work out curricula and teaching plans, publish a school paper and recommend teachers. A system of school visitations was also provided and the central board was to inspect their reports.[116]

---

[115] Synodalbericht 1888, 46-8. The purpose of the schools was to rear children as decent and faithful members of the church and so far as possible to equip them with the knowledge and skills they would need for civil vocations. Such matters as vacation periods or tuition fees were to be specified by each congregation. Both in regard to calls and dismissals of teachers the synod was to have a voice. The school board of five was to have pastor and teacher as standing members, the former serving as chairman and the latter as secretary.

[116] Synodalbericht 1890, 59-60. The staff at Waverly was to function as this board and the Ausschuss might act, if this should make additional teachers necessary. This arrangement was made at a time when there was alarm over compulsory school legislation, which will be noted. After this had passed complaints arose that board functions conflicted with those of other synodical and district officers. It functioned until 1899 when it made a routine report, pointing out among other matters that too many congregations used their pastors as teachers. The floor committee took more note of complaints than of the report and the board was abolished and its duties distributed. At the same time, on complaints from the Western District, the visitation system was greatly weakened, by providing that only schools where teachers were employed should be regularly visited, others only on request of pastor or congregation. Synodalbericht 1899, 75-6.

Around the year 1890 a flurry of excitement arose when midwestern states began to consider compulsory attendance laws, which carried provisions for instruction exclusively in English even in parochial schools, and also for identical curricula with those of public schools. In Wisconsin and Illinois such laws were passed and they were introduced in most midwestern legislatures. The convention of 1890 laid down the synodical position in a statement which was issued in both languages. It asserted that public schools were necessary and that it was the duty of synodical members to support them. Their non-sectarian and sometimes irreligious character, however, made parochial schools necessary also. In them the German language as yet was necessary, but English must be taught also. The synod did not ask for public support for these schools, in fact it was opposed to it, and it could not concede the right to the state to dictate subjects, language, methods of instruction and qualifications of teachers, while they were privately supported. Elementary subjects were taught in them by professional teachers. Synod favored compulsory education as long as parents retained the right to select the school, and opposed it if public school attendance was required. It was necessary on grounds of principle to oppose legislation violating the rights and duties set forth, which was out of harmony with the spirit of the federal and state constitutions. Such legislation would be opposed with all legal and moral means, regardless of party.[117]

For the first time in its history the synod thus was prepared to resort to political pressure. Organization for purposes of resistance was advocated in its organ.[118] In various states committees were set up for this purpose and in Illinois and Wisconsin support was given to movements for repeal of the offensive legislation.[119] In Wisconsin a more satisfactory measure was substituted very soon, but the Edwards Act in Illinois remained in force despite promises of politicians of 1890 to modify it. During the election year of 1892 the Kirchenblatt carried an appeal to vote for Altgeld for governor and to support the Democratic party, because the Republicans were held responsible for failure to carry out repeal promises of 1890, an appeal which under the name of the Southern District was later extended to all Germans.[120] After a Democratic victory in that year, Illinois substituted a satisfactory measure for the Edwards Act.

---

[117] Synodalbericht 1890, 60-62 (German), 62-4 (English). The statement asserted that the duty to support public schools had never been questioned. German instruction could not as yet be abandoned, because of immigrant parents, even if the synod wished to do so, although it did not.

[118] K. B. XXXIII, 12, 94-5. Lutz noted that a measure had failed to pass in the Iowa legislature in 1890, but suggested that it was likely to come up again and that it might be wise to form an organization in opposition. Organizations might well also be formed in Nebraska, Missouri and Minnesota. Attention was called to the laws passed in Wisconsin and Illinois as warning examples of the danger threatening parochial schools.

[119] Synodalbericht Westl. Dist. 1891, 21, 30, reports that a conference had set up a committee to oppose such legislation in Nebraska which the president had sanctioned and authorized to act for the state. Definite organization of such committees was suggested for Nebraska, Missouri and Kansas and adopted. The report for 1892, 8-9, 12, again referred to the matter and it was resolved that the committee remain active and report even if no danger threatened. Synodalbericht Suedl. Dist. 1891, 12, 41, reports that the Illinois law remained unchanged despite election promises and refers to threats of similar legislation in Iowa, part of which was in that district. A committee was authorized to raise funds if necessary to maintain opposition.

This episode passed and the right to maintain parochial schools was preserved. It is doubtful, however, whether the parochial school can really be considered as firmly entrenched. Only in exceptional cases did congregations actually engage professional teachers. So far as available statistics go the high point was reached in 1898 when there were thirty-four teachers, in the same year 390 pastors in active service were serving 333 synodical and 318 non-synodical congregations. There were also five assistant pastors, who probably had teaching duties. The percentage therefore at best was low. Nor was the force of teachers increasing rapidly. The normal department was one of the weakest at Waverly by that time and there was complaint that teachers in service were withdrawing in favor of more remunerative positions.[121] The few graduates of the normal course were therefore replacing losses, rather than significantly increasing total numbers. The burden of teaching thus continued to rest primarily upon the pastors. Most of them continued to carry on the work, but as public schools became well established, parochial schools so conducted found it increasingly difficult to compete.[122]

---

[120] K. B. XXXIV, 6, 47, reported defeat of a similar measure in Minnesota and 7, 65, notes the change made in Wisconsin and the failure of Illinois to take similar action. In the next year XXXV, 12, 92, carried a notice by Richter blaming a Republican majority in the upper house in Illinois for failure to act on repeal, credited the Democrats with attempts to carry out campaign promises of 1890, and carried the appeal noted. It was stated that it was unfortunate that the church had to mix in politics, but liberty of conscience made it necessary to do so. The appeal in behalf of the

Congregational organization had settled down into a pattern, which was not greatly changed during the period. Vestries and congregational meetings continued to function as in earlier periods. The German language was commonly used

---

Southern District with a similar note of regret is in 26, 167. Success was noted XXXVI, 14, 110.

[121] The writer has found little information on salaries for teachers. In the Southern District in 1891 nine teachers averaged $399 per year, but other data are lacking for comparison. Pastors in that district at the same time drew average salaries of $386, but the district had fifty-seven parishes, Synodalbericht Suedl. Dist. 1891, 15.

[122] Ibid., it was reported that while there were only nine teachers, parochial schools existed in forty-nine of the fifty-seven parishes and on p. 36 it was recorded that the pastors of the parishes in which there were no schools were called to account. There is no indication, however, of the kind of school, length of term, or subjects of instruction. The total number of children of school age in the district was not given, but the number of children in attendance was only 1,731 of whom 231 were not children of members. Synodalbericht Westl. Dist. 1900 gives statistics:

	1897	1898	1899
Children of school age	2,872	3,144	3,165
Children in school	1,867	1,812	2,040

but does not give the number of schools or of professional teachers.

both in services and in meetings, the younger generation learning it in the schools as well as at home. English services were introduced occasionally, but were as yet uncommon. Except in the newer mission areas, congregational properties now usually comprised parsonages as well as churches and commonly schools also.[123] Reports of dedications of new structures in the Kirchenblatt were common. Means for supporting congregational activities were raised through a system of annual pledges which occasionally were raised through equal assessments on all families, but commonly through voluntary signatures. In 1885 the total raised for local purposes in the synod was given as $89,457.52. In 1892 this had risen to $202,234.60, in 1898 to $258,076, and in 1904 it stood at $362,138.[124] The average salary paid to pastors throughout the synod was computed in 1894 at $338.17, the Western District being low with an average of $252, the Northern with the bulk of the central field in Iowa paying almost exactly the synodical average with $337.21, and the Eastern being high with an average of $424.58. In some instances pastors received less than $200 and many received less than $300. Pastors received houses in addition and also perquisites which were estimated as averaging $50 annually. The survey stated that this average compared unfavorably with any other American church, Lutheran and non-Lutheran which had been investigated and made a plea for substantial increases.[125] Some results seem to have been obtained for in 1902 the Western District reported that the average there had risen to approximately $311.50.[126]

---

[123] In the Western District where much missionary activity was establishing many new congregations it was reported in 1891 that there were forty-nine pastors and eighty-one congregations, of which fifty-one had churches valued at $74,000. Seven had been built during the **last** year, Synodalbericht Westl. Dist. 1891, 14, 25-6.

[124] Synodalbericht 1885, 51; 1893, 117; 1899, 180-1; 1904, 156.

Funds for synodical purposes continued to be raised through offerings assigned to specific Sundays. In 1884 $10,339.08 was raised for such purposes, in 1893 this had risen to $26,233.94, in 1898 to $31,889.43 while in 1904 the amount was given as $60,294.28.[127] Particularly for purposes of higher education special appeals were taken from time to time, which usually involved personal solicitations of the members for special contributions through pastors or special collectors, and which raised funds for erection of buildings or clearance of debts. The amounts raised for benevolence increased sufficiently to make possible maintenance of three educational institutions and to carry on extensive missionary work. Support was also given to foreign missions, especially to the New Guinea field of Neuendettelsau and to charitable undertakings, such as the orphanages, though the synod as such did not operate these institutions or conduct a foreign mission of its own.

---

[125] K. B. XXXIX, 3, 26. The Wisconsin District was second high with $371 and the Southern not far behind with $368.74, while Dakota was next to last with $269.05. The salaries were compared unfavorably also with white collar and farm incomes and in the lower brackets with labor. A second report in 5, 50-1, gave an estimate of necessary pastoral expenses and made a plea for increases, while a third, 7, 78-9, seconded the plea with suggestions for procedure and attributed the state of affairs to German state church backgrounds and modesty of pastoral demands in early years. Synodalbericht 1885, 50, gave the average salary of that year as $291.20 inclusive of salaries paid by the synod to its employees with the implication that this raised the average.

[126] In 1889 the average in this district had been only about $230, Synodalbericht Westl. Distrikt 1889, 26, but 1903, 16, gave the new figure and stated that three pastors were receiving $600 while a total of seven out of sixty-nine received $500 or more. It was pointed out that such a pay scale must deter youth from entering the ministry, despite the critical shortage of pastors.

[127] See the sources given in footnote 124. In 1904 an additional amount of $6,965 for benevolences was recorded as not having passed through synodical treasuries. The Sunday School offerings in Lent for missions and a regular offering for travel to synodical conventions, both mentioned elsewhere in this chapter, were added to the regular offerings of the

In terms of averages for communicant members the contributions remained low, coming to just under $4 for local purposes and to not quite $.67 for benevolences. For voting members, who probably reflected families with approximate accuracy, the averages were approximately $13.50 and $2.25 respectively. Perhaps such calculations induced Deindoerfer in 1901 to deplore a lack of synodical consciousness, which he found manifested in such episodes as the difficulties over the Clinton debt, in a strong tendency to neglect synodical causes in favor of congregational activities and in a lack of appreciation of the necessity of the work of the synod in higher

---

previous period. A regular offering had been assigned also to the first Sunday in Lent, apparently when that Sunday was designated as penitential Sunday in 1879, which was assigned to educational institutions.

education.[128] In a third Denkschrift written for the anniversary of 1904 Deindoerfer also felt that while the synod was upholding the old ideals in regard to practice, ground had been lost in the struggle against worldly ways and in the practice of brotherly discipline between members. In regard to secret societies principles were being maintained, but practice was not always in harmony with them. Parochial education was inadequate, chiefly because of the disinclination of congregations to establish adequate schools with professional teachers.[129]

Publication activities of the synod were greatly extended. The Kirchenblatt was now published on a bi-weekly basis and was somewhat enlarged, its circulation increasing to 8,000 by 1904.[130] The Kirchliche Zeitschrift continued to be published on a bi-monthly basis. Until near the end of the period there was little change in its heavily doctrinal content and its circulation remained small. After 1900 when

---

[128] K. B. XLIV, 1, 2-3.

[129] Deindoerfer, Denkschrift zur 50 jaehrigen Jubelfeier der Evang.-Luth. Synode von Iowa und andern Staaten, Chicago, 1904. This pamphlet will hereafter be cited as Denkschrift 50.

[130] Synodalbericht 1904, 95. This figure represented an increase from about 5,000 over the preceding two years. Finances of the Kirchenblatt continued to be administered separately and its treasury had shown a surplus for some time, disposition of which was mentioned occasionally in connection with expansion of the publication business or of the libraries of educational institutions.

M. Reu became editor, greater variety of content was introduced and circulation improved.[131] Blaetter aus den Waisenhaeusern was abandoned at about the same time and the Jugendblatt substituted, which was designed to serve the youth of the church and gave space to the orphanages to present their cause.[132] This paper was published monthly. Various textbooks for schools were published, such as readers for instruction in German, Reu's Catechism being scheduled to appear as the period ended. Devotional and popular literature was also published.[133]

A new beginning in synodical publication activities was made in 1882 with the creation of a standing Buecher-commission. Its primary purpose, as originally constituted, was selection of suitable textbooks for parochial schools and it was authorized to select books from outside sources as well as to encourage revision or writing of synodical publications. While it was given power to enter into contracts, it was instructed to proceed carefully and to avoid financial risks, but it was to work toward uniformity of textbooks in parochial schools and its recommendations were to have binding force.

---

[131] Synodalbericht 1899, 138-9; 1902, 113. Monthly appearance was authorized in the former year, if finances should warrant, but was not accomplished during the period. Circulation figures were not given.

[132] Ibid., 113.

[133] The reports of the publication commission in the synodical reports after 1882 give information on publications. An older generation will remember Wartburg Lesebuch I and II and the Wartburg Fibel, while Reu's Catechism was later translated into English.

For distribution purposes it also received authority to establish sales agencies.[134] Two such agencies, in the east and the west, were subsequently established and operation at a profit was reported in 1885, when the convention of that year somewhat expanded the functions of the commission.[135]

With changed personnel the commission acted with much energy to build up a going concern during the next three years. Finding the agencies inefficient and unprofitable, it established its depository in Waverly and placed it in charge of a manager. Frankly disregarding instructions, efforts were made to build up a serviceable stock and to sell aggressively, with the result that volume of sales was quadrupled by 1888. Various publications also were undertaken, among them that of an annual synodical almanac, the Wartburg Kalender, which first appeared in 1887 and which was successful from the beginning. With the consent of the Ausschuss the synodical printery had been relocated at Waverly, where a building had been rented under an option to buy, in order to house printery and depository. All this had been financed by sale of non-interest-bearing stock and through loans. Though the printery did not yet show a profit, the convention of 1888 approved all transactions, reorganized the commission into a publication commission with its own statute and provisionally adopted regulations for the manager.[136]

---

[134] Synodalbericht 1882, 27-9. The Synodalkasse was to advance needed funds, which were to be repaid from sales. The agents were to receive liberal commissions and might receive advances up to $500.

[135] The western agency was in charge of Prof. Eichler at Waverly, who was a member of the commission. Teacher Kuehn and later Pastor Lauritzen operated the eastern agency. The commission was instructed to examine German arithmetics and to recommend and stock the best, it was to sell church papers, but only those of the synod or those recommended by it, and was to handle materials stocked by the synodical printery. The commission also recommended a change in its personnel, since its members had found it difficult to meet, which was made, Synodalbericht 1885, 43, 48.

In the following years the printery was placed on a paying basis and the building acquired. A more efficient press was purchased, so that book publication could be undertaken and a bindery established. The manager was placed on a salaried basis and given permanent standing.[137] As early as

---

[136] The new commission found that the agents were paid 5 per cent on all sales, regardless of whether payment was received, and handled only a very limited stock. The result was that the stock was valued at $842.86, amounts receivable were $1,721.14 and amounts payable slightly higher than the latter figure. The new manager was paid 8 per cent on cash returns. Various endeavors were made to secure prompt payment, but slowness in this respect was to plague the business throughout the period. The stock was built up, among other ways, by importations to make it serve the needs of the pastors generally. By 1888 monthly volume of sales was not far from $1,000 and the stock was clear property, amounts payable being covered by amounts receivable. The option to buy the building at Waverly at $2,000 ran for ten years; 200 shares, repayable within ten years had been sold at $10. Amount of loans was not given. These funds had been used to buy equipment for the printery, failure of which to operate at a profit was attributed to business methods needing correction, Synodalbericht 1888, 52-63, 65, 66-71. The last pages give the statute for the committee and the provisional regulations for the manager.

[137] Synodalbericht 1890, 51-6; 1893, 91-8. The old press was turned in on the new one which cost $3,000, of which the Kirchenblatt paid $1,500. By 1893 the building had become inadequate and relocation was considered, Clinton receiving consideration. Of the shares only $685 were still outstanding in 1893. The manager in 1890 was allowed a

1893 space was becoming cramped in Waverly and consideration was given to relocation in a larger city. In 1896 the book department was moved to Chicago. Though sales volume increased, the separation occasioned difficulties, but no further change was made during the period. By 1904 the publication committee was able to report that it had no debt, that annual volume of business exceeded $50,000 and that surplus profits paid into synodical treasuries since 1900 were then being remitted at a rate exceeding $3,000 per year.[138] This business venture received the name Wartburg Publishing House.

The issue arising in the preceding period in regard to the private or synodical character of the Pfarrwitwenkasse was not settled until 1885, when the synod withdrew and a private society took over this enterprise, retaining the old

---

salary of $700 plus $100 rent allowance. He was Paulus List, who was long to remain in charge. It may be noted that at the request of the publication committee extensive revisions were made in 1896 in the statute and instructions, Synodalbericht 1896, 157-60.

[138] Synodalbericht 1896, 151-60; 1899, 132-40; 1902, 113-6; 1904, 94-101. The removal was delayed after 1893 because of adverse business conditions. Return to Waverly from Chicago seems first to have been contemplated, but in 1904 the committee received authorization to set aside 50 per cent of its profits until $10,000 had been accumulated in order to purchase a building, apparently in Chicago. Profits paid to synodical treasuries were reported in 1902 at the rate of little less than $1,400 a year. The amount reported so paid over the preceding two years in 1904 was $7,103.87. In 1902 the property was valued at $44,738.50. While no debts were reported in 1904 $3,200 were carried as borrowed to cover accounts payable while amounts receivable were given as $16,948.72 for books, plus more than $1,700 for publications.

name. The capital fund was turned over to the new society and gradually grew to amount to approximately $9,000, while annual dues were $5 and offerings were no longer lifted for this purpose.[139] The Lutheran Mutual Aid Society prospered modestly but was also a private rather than a synodical undertaking. In 1895 a Lutheran Mutual Fire Insurance Company was organized under the laws of Wisconsin, for the purpose of insuring congregational buildings and the personal property of pastors and teachers.[140] Though this society when organized operated exclusively within the synod, it also was not a synodical affair.

---

[139] Data on this matter are conveniently assembled in Deindoerfer, *Synode von Iowa*, 63. Deindoerfer made it clear, as he had also done in *K*. *B*. XLIV, 1, 2, that he disapproved of the change. It became necessary because increasing numbers of pastors were no longer making payments, preferring to provide for their families through life insurance. Support granted amounted only to $75 annually plus $25 for burial costs. Deindoerfer stated that membership in the society was relatively small, but gave no numbers. See also *Synodalbericht 1882*, 27; *1885*, 39-40, and *Statuten fuer die Pfarrwitwenkasse*, *Waverly*, *1888*.

[140] *K*. *B*. XXXVIII, 13, 157, reports the project and brings constitution and by-laws, 157-60. Further information was given, 16, 194, and organization reported, 23, 245. Mr. Boerner of Iowa City who was interested in the Mutual Aid had suggested such a project as early as 1886. In 1895 the amount of insurable property in the synod was estimated at over a million dollars. Congregations were urged to drop existing policies, the project would never become feasible if they were to be allowed to expire first. Applications covering property worth $200,000 were considered necessary to make a start, at the organization applications on hand covered about $175,000, but assurances were on hand covering about $120,000 more. Rates were advertised as favorable. The society would operate only in the synod for the present, but would consider extension to other Lutheran bodies later.

At the time when the synod abandoned the Pfarrwitwenkasse, the problem of support for aged pastors was becoming acute. Many of the older men who had worked for pittances for a lifetime were approaching the age of retirement. The convention of 1885 considered establishment of a treasury for support of retired pastors, but postponed action until 1888. If emergencies should arise in the meantime, the president was authorized to ask each pastor to contribute one per cent of his salary to be paid to district treasurers. District presidents were to appoint committees in case of need to fix aid payments, while any excess was to remain at the disposition of the synod.[141] In case of need appeal might also be made to the Gademann Stiftung. This small fund, untouched since the sixties, had increased considerably, but remained too small to be of great aid.[142] Apparently this plan proved adequate to meet such situations as may have arisen, for no action by the convention of 1888 is recorded.

---

[141] Synodalbericht 1885, 38-9. Apparently each district might dispose of funds raised within its limits, but unused funds remained at the disposition of the synod.

[142] Deindoerfer reported on this fund in 1895, explaining its origin to a new generation. It had originally been invested in land at St. Sebald, which had later been sold at a profit and the proceeds invested. With interest added to the capital until very recently, the fund had increased from the original $371.39 to $2,213.06 in 1895 and recently several small grants had been made from it. Though the incorporation originally projected had never been consummated, it was managed by four turstees, one of whom was Deinzer as Loehe's successor, which caused difficulties of administration, K. B. XXXVIII, 6, 67.

When Gottfried Fritschel died in 1889 he left a widow with a large family in straitened circumstances. A Gottfried Fritschel Verein was thereupon formed among members of the synod for the immediate purpose of buying a house for the widow. She was to have its use for life and thereafter it might be sold and the funds realized used for retired pastors as the Gottfried Fritschel Stiftung. Members pledged small annual dues for the purpose of raising funds. A residence in Waverly was soon purchased and turned over to the widow.[143] Private measures of this kind were, however, obviously inadequate. The convention of 1890 resolved to meet the situation by establishing an Emeritenkasse. All pastors were to be required to pay one-half per cent of their salaries into this treasury annually. A committee was created to manage administration, applications for aid were to be made to it through district presidents. It was also to solicit funds from congregations and bequests. Excess income was to be invested.[144]

---

[143] K. B. XXXIII, 1, 7; 11, 87. Apparently the members of the society began with a larger contribution. Annual dues were to be $.50. By May 1890 purchase of a house for $800 was reported, of which $500 had been paid. Additional subscriptions were requested. K. B. XXXIX 15, 182, valued the house at $1,200 and noted that $50 of the purchase price was still unpaid, but that annual dues were being used to pay this in 1896. The fund therefore was not contributing aid to other cases at that time. It was not mentioned during this period.

[144] Synodalbericht 1890, 65-6.

Under this plan sufficient funds were secured to make monthly pensions of $15-$25 possible for a number of retired pastors and to build up a fund of $4,660 by 1904.[145] For the anniversary year of 1904 a special appeal was authorized as a synodical thankoffering, the proceeds of which were to go to this treasury. A reorganization of the treasury was also projected on which no final action had been taken when the period ended.[146]

A Kirchbauanleihkasse was also established in 1890. It was to provide funds for loans to congregations needing aid for building churches and was to operate as a revolving fund. Needs of this kind had existed since the synod was organized and the great expansion of recent years had no doubt made the need acute. As early as 1879 a request for a loan for this purpose from a congregation to the synod is on record.[147]

---

[145] Synodalbericht 1904, 91-3. In the two preceding years $5,248.69 had been received, of which $4,301.49 was used to support fifteen pastors with monthly payments of $15-$20, one having recently been raised to $25. Additional support had been given to some, but no details were given.

[146] The anniversary offering had been authorized two years earlier, the treasurer expressed the hope that it might raise $40-$50,000, for the number of retired pastors was rapidly increasing and the time was not far off when the existing system would no longer raise adequate amounts. The congregations do not seem to have contributed much, and no regular offering was as yet raised for the treasury. Pastor Bergstedt had proposed a plan for reorganization, which was to be published and referred to the districts. Interest from the proceeds of the anniversary appeal was to be added to the fund until a reorganization was effected, though there was opposition to this proposal, which suggested that aid payments be raised, Synodalbericht 1902, 123; 1904, 91-3.

[147] See a letter, Giesel - Grossmann, Baraboo, July 31, 1879, in I. S. D. A loan of $800 on a church worth $2,000 and insured for $1,000 was requested. The writer referred

It is possible that occasional loans were made, though no record of them was found. The synod made no specific provision for funds for the new treasury, but placed a committee in charge which was to solicit contributions and also to make loans in accordance with an established procedure.[148]

The orphanage in Toledo remained under the supervision of Pastor Beckel until his death in 1894 and was thereafter administered by Pastor F. Schmeltz. Several additions to its building were erected and a school was built. In 1904 plans were getting under way for providing a home for the aged also. In 1890 the home cared for fifty-four children, in 1900 for sixty-six.[149] The Andrew orphanage was served by several superintendents, under whom it was gradually able to retire its heavy debt. In 1898 relocation of the institution to Waverly was taken under consideration. That city was more favorably located and construction was needed at Andrew. When an opportunity for a sale of the Andrew property arose and when Waverly offered to contribute $5,000 toward construction of a building, its offer was accepted. A site of thirty-four acres was acquired and a structure was erected for $16,000, which was occupied late in 1900, only a small debt remaining.[150]

---

to oral consultation with synodical officials and asked for a decision. Apparently he had been given some reason to hope that the loan would be made, but no record of it was found.

[148] Synodalbericht 1890, 66-7.

[149] Poppen, Goldenes Jubilaeum, 17, 18, 19, 21.

[150] Festschrift, 10-12; K. B. XLIV, 1, 4.

In 1894 Pastor H. Reinemund at Muscatine, Iowa, was informed that a bequest made a local estate available to anyone who would use it to found an orphanage or a home for the aged. He was asked to take the matter in hand and, though the bequest was not finally received until 1903, founded and incorporated a society with members of his congregation for the purpose of founding a deaconess institute with a girls' school, orphanage, home for the aged, hospital and home for the feebleminded. Five acres of land with a large partially completed brick structure, just outside Muscatine, were received as a gift. With the gift came an opportunity to buy an estate of 800 acres, of which the gift had been a part, for $50,000 or any part of it at a proportionate cost. The society undertook to buy half of this and began to appeal for memberships and funds.[151] Completion of the brick structure was undertaken in 1895 and early in 1896 the building was dedicated. Orphans and aged people were accepted, the other functions envisaged by the society were not destined to be realized.[152] When the question of relocating the Andrew orphanage came up, combination with Muscatine was considered but rejected.[153] When the bequest of 1894 was finally awarded to the institution in 1903 in the amount of $6,000-$7,000, it was set aside for construction of a separate building to house the aged.[154]

---

[151] K. B. XXXVIII, 9, 103. The name of the woman who made the bequest was not given, the donor of the land was Miss Hershey. Reinemund gave the impression that he hoped to get much of the $25,000 needed for the purchase in Muscatine, but strongly advocated acquisition of the entire tract, from the proceeds of which he calculated that the institution could become very nearly self-supporting. For this purpose particularly he appealed for gifts. The constitution of the Society is given 12, 147, its organization in December 1894 was reported XXXVII, 26, 221.

[152] K. B. XXXVIII, 19, 228; XXXIX, 14, 164. The latter reports the dedication at which S. Fritschel officiated. This and the publicity in the synodical organ indicate synodical approval. Deindoerfer, however, appended an editorial comment to a renewed appeal for funds in the first source cited, in

With the foundation of Muscatine there were thus three charitable societies operating institutions within the synod and appealing primarily to its members for support. Deindoerfer called attention to this in 1896 and pointed out that the regulations of 1867 were no longer generally understood, that Muscatine added a new element, and that Toledo was no longer drawing support from Ohio and Michigan circles. Support for all three societies came from synodical circles, but the synod had no control over the societies.[155] In 1899 the

---

which he endorsed the undertaking as a worthy cause, but pointed out that it was not a synodical undertaking and that support, given to it, must not interfere with synodical causes. The Clinton debt was then huge and pressing.

[153] K. B. XLI, 1, 10; XLIII, 3, 28. The latter source indicates that this incident left some feeling between the two institutions. From it it also appears that Muscatine had made an attempt to purchase the entire estate, but had returned it to Miss Hershey, repurchasing 200 acres for $12,000, she herself contributing $5,000 toward the purchase, reducing the debt to $1,000. There was also mention of dissension in the Muscatine Society. Deindoerfer, however, added a statement that there was no reason for not giving the Muscatine group the same confidence as the two other societies.

[154] K. B. XLVI, 16, 188. A rival claim had been made for the bequest.

[155] Synodalbericht 1896, 28-9, 33. Deindoerfer suggested that a committee should investigate the entire situation and

synod resolved to recognize only societies whose foundation and constitutions it had approved. The societies should be responsible for the management of their institutions, but the general president should have voice and vote in their annual meetings and the right to conduct visitations. The synod should also lay down regulations for the apportionment of funds among the orphanages.[156] The only further action taken in 1902 was to require superintendents to render annual reports at the beginning of each year.[157] In 1904, however, each of the institutions were assigned a number of districts from which their support was to come.[158]

---

make recommendations. The floor committee declared itself unable to make recommendations, but suggested that a committee be appointed for the purpose to report in 1899.

[156] All three societies met the qualifications. It was also provided that pastors of the synod serving as superintendents should retain all their rights and duties as members of the synod. No specific financial regulations were laid down, but the general treasurer was authorized to apportion undesignated funds if the societies sent in annual reports. This was a provisional arrangement until 1902, Synodalbericht 1899, 145.

[157] Synodalbericht 1902, 11, 20. The president suggested this requirement, reporting that he had overlooked his rights under the regulations of 1899 and had not exercised them.

[158] Synodalbericht 1904, 104-6. Toledo was assigned the Eastern and Texas; Waverly, the Northern, Wisconsin, and Dakota; Muscatine the Southern and Western Districts. Richter had suggested this division, assigning Wisconsin to Toledo, however. Donors in other districts were not to be forbidden to designate gifts to other institutions than those assigned to them, but it was hoped that they would come to feel an interest in their institution and voluntarily support it. Superintendents might not undertake solicitation tours beyond their boundaries without permission of the district presidents. This time the superintendents had overlooked their new duty of making annual reports, but had rendered them on request.

Although divided into district synods, the synod in 1879 as yet comprised only an Eastern and a Western District as organized in 1873. The unwieldly Western District, however, received permission to subdivide itself in that year. At its district convention in 1880 this district met for the last time in its old form and resolved to divide itself into three parts. Division was to be by conferences. The Northern Iowa, Dubuque, and Wisconsin Conferences together with new missions in Dakota not yet organized into a conference were to form the Northern District. A Southern District was formed from the Southern Iowa, Mendota, and Southern Illinois Conferences, the latter of which included a few congregations in eastern Missouri. The Missouri and Nebraska Conferences were to form the new Western District. Together with the Eastern District which remained unchanged the synod was therefore after 1880 composed of four district synods.[159]

Both the Northern and the Western Districts remained rather unwieldly structures, spread over a large area, over which communications were not easy. Nothing further was done in the latter case, since the district had its heavy concentration in Nebraska and since neither Missouri nor Kansas developed enough strength to form a separate district and lack of stations in eastern Kansas did not make it advisable to draw them together into one unit, with perhaps the outlying congregations in Colorado and Oklahoma. In the case of the Northern District, however, there was a good deal of growth both in Wisconsin and in Dakota, as well as in Iowa and Minnesota. By 1888 accordingly this district again requested and received permission to subdivide itself.[160] In the next year this division was carried out through organization of separate Wisconsin and Dakota Districts, leaving northern Iowa and Minnesota to bear the name Northern District.[161] At the end of the period a further division of the Northern District was approved. The convention of 1904 approved organization of congregations in Minnesota and the northern two tiers of Iowa counties into the new Northern District, while the remaining congregations in Iowa were to form the Iowa District. Consummation of the division was left to the next convention of the old Northern District.[162] At the end of the period therefore the synod was divided into seven districts, inclusive of the Texas Synod, and had given approval to the establishment of an eighth.

---

[159] K. B. XXIII, 14, 108. The Dakota congregations were provisionally assigned to the Northern District and might if they chose join the Western District, but they never did so. The Northern and Southern Districts elected officers and perfected their provisional organization at the district convention in 1880 at St. Sebald which made the division. No Nebraska and only one of the Missouri pastors were present. Grossmann was therefore instructed to administer this district provisionally and to conduct its organization, 16, 123. The organization meeting was held in October at Febing, Nebraska, though only ten of twenty-two pastors and only three congregations were represented, 24, 190.

---

[160] Synodalbericht 1888, 7, 49. Permission to subdivide if the district found it advisable was requested, apparently no specific plans had been submitted or even prepared. The permission granted required a two-thirds majority at the next district convention to approve the proposed division.

[161] Synodalbericht 1890, 16, notes the consummations and records approval.

As the synod grew larger, it became increasingly difficult to gather the membership-at-large together in conventions which every member and delegates of every synodical congregation were expected to attend. In 1883 the Western District submitted a proposal that a special convention meet in some centrally located congregation in 1884 to provide for delegate conventions, in which both clergy and laity would be represented through elected delegates. The president favored the proposal and it was submitted to the district conventions of 1884. Though it failed to carry, the reason was not opposition to the representative plan, but the impression that the intention was to transfer the meeting place for the next general convention to the west, although Toledo had been designated.[163] The representative project was discussed in the Kirchenblatt prior to the convention of 1885 and a number of reasons submitted in its support. The territorial extent of the synod had grown so large that many pastors could not attend and many congregations did not send delegates in any case. It was also becoming difficult to find congregations which could provide hospitality for so large a group. With a large attendance, debate had a tendency to be prolonged, so that it was difficult to dispose of the mass of business accumulating over three-year intervals.[164]

---

[162] Permission to make such a division had been requested in 1902, but the synod had decided that permission could only be granted if a detailed plan were submitted and had invited its submission in 1904, Synodalbericht 1902, 124. Apparently thus a new procedure was being followed, which prevented consummation of the division in 1903. Synodalbericht 1904, 26, records the proposal and its approval.

[163] Synodalbericht 1885, 8, Grossmann denied that he had desired to deprive Toledo of the next regular convention.

The way had thus been prepared for a consideration of such a constitutional change in 1885. A paper on the subject, which the Ausschuss had already considered, together with an opinion of the latter presented reasons and suggested procedures. The convention agreed to the change and provided that henceforth voting members of the districts should elect a clerical representative for every five pastors and a lay delegate for every five congregations at the district conventions next preceding a general convention. The delegate convention should consist of the delegates so chosen and of all synodical officers, inclusive of chairmen of standing committees, the district presidents, the theological professors and one delegate each from the faculties of all other institutions, who as ex officio members should have voice and vote and should accordingly be ineligible for election as delegates.[165]

---

[164] K. B. XXVIII, 1, 1-2.

[165] Synodalbericht 1885, 11-14. The paper was read by S. Fritschel. It may have been prepared at the direction of the Ausschuss, at any rate the latter seems to have submitted

These provisions were placed in effect at the district conventions of 1887, when delegates were elected who constituted the convention of 1888. By that time, however, doubts in regard to the constitutionality of the procedure had arisen, probably occasioned by the fact that the resolutions of 1885 had not mentioned constitutional amendment. The situation may have been complicated by the fact that the synodical constitution as finally adopted in 1879 had not contained an amending clause at all. The convention therefore named a committee to look into the constitutionality of the change, which was also to recommend other needed amendments. The convention itself also altered the procedure in regard to synodical matters submitted for a vote to the district conventions.[166] Legal advice seems to have established un-

---

recommendations to the convention in its opinion on the paper, for the president's report stated that a project would be submitted. Neither the paper, nor the opinion were included, however. Extended discussion was reported and it is possible that it resulted in changes or substitutions, for it is not indicated whether the resolutions adopted followed the recommendations. Fractions of two or more pastors or congregations were to be entitled to an additional delegate. The manner of election was left to the districts until such time as the synod might establish regulations. It was recommended that districts in the election give special consideration to members of synodical standing committees should that appear advisable.

[166] Synodalbericht 1888, 49-50. The committee (Grossmann, Kraushaar, S. Fritschel) was to obtain legal advice on the question of constitutionality and in addition was to make needed revisions, submitting them to district conventions who were to report their action to the president. If the districts voted on synodical questions the vote was to be recorded by the secretary and submitted to the general president, who was to submit all results to the Ausschuss.

constitutionality of the procedure of 1885, for a series of complicated maneuvers followed.

The Ausschuss induced the Eastern District formally to propose constitutional amendments. The Ausschuss then called a special session of the general synod, without delegates, to meet in 1889 in connection with the convention of the Southern District, which met to deal with the constitutional issues. A similar special convention was called once more to meet just before the delegate convention of 1890. No reports were printed on the two special sessions. It is probable, however, that they adopted amending clauses in the form thereafter carried in the constitution. The committee appointed in 1888 also reported to them on revisions and a number of minor changes were made. It is probable that they also ratified the actions of the convention of 1888. Through these actions the change to the delegate system was given constitutional validity and the convention of 1890, as distinguished from the immediately preceding special conventions, and its successors were composed of elected representatives.[167]

A two-thirds majority of the votes cast was required. This seems to have been revised during the subsequent proceedings, for in the version of the constitution printed in Deindoerfer, Geschichte (1897) 295, the provision reads that yea and nay votes should be cast by ballot, the ballots sealed and sent to the general president, who after all districts should have voted, was to have them counted, a simple majority of votes cast sufficing. Another provision was added, that this procedure should be used only in cases of extreme necessity.

[167] The procedure is outlined, Synodalbericht 1890, 6-7. Notice of the action of the Eastern District was given K. B. XXXII, 13, 99. A brief italicized notice, 19, 149, was followed immediately by a notice announcing the regular meeting

In subsequent years changes and additions of a constitutional nature were occasionally made. Since a body of amendments thus gradually accumulated, the president suggested a committee of revision in 1902 which was to incorporate the amendments into the body of the constitution. Such a committee

---

of the Southern District, October 3, and called a special general convention to meet in Peoria, October 2, 1889, giving no particulars. Peoria may have been chosen as a central location and since most other districts had already met, the matter may have been explained and publicized there. A report on the district convention, 21, 165, stated that many pastors had been present the day before it convened to attend the special session. The report on the procedure in 1890 stated that the special convention of 1889 had made arrangements quietly and that it had heard and acted on the report of the special committee of 1888. The special general session of 1890 on June 5, and the regular delegate synod on June 6, 1890, were announced K. B. XXXIII, 10, 79. The constitutional version given, Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 291-8, has three additional articles (52, 53) which provide for amendments. A series of sections chiefly confessional and doctrinal was declared unamendable, another series dealing with basic organization required two-thirds majorities at two successive conventions, the remaining sections were amendable at any convention by a three-fourths majority. No doubt the special conventions adopted this and also the delegate system, which was incorporated in section 5, and two conventions were necessary, because this section fell into the second series. As incorporated it no longer fixed the ratio of one to five, but left this to the convention. It also provided that pastors not delegates, attending, might have voice but not vote. Other minor changes were made, e. g., admission of congregations was transferred to districts. There is no mention anywhere in the sources consulted of ratification of the actions of 1888, but it seems probable that this would have been done as matter of precaution. It should be added that provision for constitutional amendment seems originally to have been made in 1882 or 1885 for an undated edition of the constitution printed by the old printery at Defiance and therefore certainly before 1888 contains a paragraph which declares confessional and doctrinal sections unalterable, without, however, specifying them by number. In other cases amendments proposed by districts could be carried by two-thirds votes at two successive conventions. The procedure adopted had conflicted with these provisions, which themselves were amended as noted.

was authorized with instructions to report its revision to the Ausschuss, which was empowered to order the revision printed. It was also provided that further constitutional changes should be made in the form of by-laws. This revision was made and approved by the Ausschuss, but not printed. Instead the revision was submitted to the convention of 1904, which gave formal approval.[168] The period thus ended with a constitutional revision of minor significance and with the adoption of the distinction between constitution and by-laws.

It remained difficult to get congregations regularly to attend synodical conventions as well as those of the districts through lay delegates.[169] The lack of interest in synodical affairs manifested through this tendency was also revealed through failure of congregations to acquire synodical membership, statistics already cited revealing that little more than half of the congregations served in 1904 held membership. The problem of travel was met through a provision in 1885 under which special offerings were raised in convention years to help defray travel costs of all delegates. This offering was made a regular annual occasion before the period ended, but it did not entirely solve the problem. Districts also in some instances made provisions to meet this difficulty.[170] The manner of electing delegates was left to the districts until 1893, when synodical regulations were laid down.[171]

---

[168] Synodalbericht 1902, 15, 20; 1904, 11-34, the revised constitution follows pp. 34-44. The printed edition of the constitution had been exhausted and the revision was to provide for a new edition. There were a number of amendments before the convention also. The Ausschuss had made a number of slight changes in the committee version and the convention made several more which were not specified.

[169] Although the ratio of representation had been reduced to one to six by 1904, the anniversary convention of 1904 was attended by only forty-one lay delegates, although according to the statistics published in the report some sixty congregations were entitled to representation. By contrast the pastors with allowance made for ex officio members were entitled to some seventy delegates and sixty-six clerical delegates plus eighteen ex officio members were present. There were also five teachers present, but they formed a special group since under the revised constitution parochial teachers were entitled to choose delegates on the same basis as other groups, who had the right to vote on all matters concerning schools and the normal school, Deindoerfer Geschichte, 292; Synodalbericht 1904, 3-6. As for districts, the Western District dealt with attendance problems in 1889 and 1891, hearing several papers on the principles involved and dealing with practical suggestions and with excuses. Both pastors and laymen were involved, but special endeavors

---

were ordered to get congregations to send delegates and to get delegates to participate actively in the conventions, Synodalbericht Westl. Dist. 1889, 14-15, 22; 1891, 19, 34-5, 39.

[170] Deindoerfer, Synode von Iowa, 23, summarizes the developments of this custom. The yield was not sufficient to defray the large Texas travel costs, with the result that this district sent only as many delegates as it could afford to reimburse from its own treasury. Deindoerfer puts this down as an unsolved problem. It is possible that the deficiencies in representation noted in the preceding footnote stemmed from this source, though it would not entirely account for deficient lay representation. In the sources cited in the last footnote on the Western District this matter is also discussed. The pastors there cooperated to an extent in an equalization agreement, a similar proposal for congregations had met favorable response, but not in sufficient volume to go into effect.

[171] They are printed in Deindoerfer, Geschichte 279. Delegates to the last convention were reeligible, but their names were to be identified as such. Fractions entitled to a separate delegate were raised to three. Congregations eligible to send lay delegates were listed and a choice made, the chosen congregations elected the delegates.

In 1893 rules of order and fixed order of business were adopted for synodical conventions on a model already in use in a district.[172]

Conferences multiplied during the period, due to the increase in numbers, but remained study groups. As already noted, under earlier provisions they were for a time placed in charge of missionary exploration, but later district mission committees were made responsible for all missionary work, though doubtless conferences continued to make suggestions and call attention to promising openings. A new visitation order was adopted in 1888 which did not, however, make material changes, but embodied practices tested through long usage and specified procedures in detail.[173] Visitations were to occur at intervals of three, at most four, years. The congregational constitution drawn up in the preceding period and already discussed, was also finally adopted as a model and accepted in many congregations though sometimes with modifications.[174]

The synodical president had been a salaried officer even during the preceding period, but after the establishment of the districts, he did not give full time to his duties. Grossmann, who continued to serve until 1893, was also first professor and director at the teachers' seminary and later at the college as long as it remained in Waverly and drew part of his compensation from that source. Grossmann submitted his resignation to the convention of 1893 and asked to be relieved of all offices. His resignation as president was accepted and he was voted a pension, but the synod asked him to retain his directorate at Waverly. He agreed to do so, but illness soon forced him to resign this office also.[175] Deindoerfer who thus far had continuously been vice-president, and who had also for many years been president of the Eastern District, was elected president, Richter becoming vice-president. Deindoerfer served also as editor of the Kirchenblatt, drawing a salary from its treasury as well as from the Synodalkasse.[176] Serving in both capacities until 1902, Deindoerfer then expressed a desire to retire, but accepted reelection as president until the anniversary year of 1904.

---

[172] Synodalbericht 1893, 23-4, they are given, 112-15. The suggestion came from the Northern District.

[173] The visitation order is printed in full in Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 280-84. It had been drafted by Deindoerfer and submitted in 1882. Provisionally adopted, a few changes were made in 1888 when it was made definitive.

[174] It is printed, Ibid., 285-91.

---

[175] Synodalbericht 1893, 18-21. Advanced age (70) and declining powers were given as the reason for the resignation. A committee brought in a resolution to accept with regret and the synod voted thanks for forty years of continuous faithful service. The pension was fixed at $400. Grossmann died in 1897 on the day of the forty-third anniversary of the organization of the synod.

[176] Ibid., 3, 108-9. Grossmann presided at the opening sessions of the convention, then yielded the chair to Deindoerfer, who served until Richter was chosen temporary chairman. At Deindoerfer's own request his salary from all sources was set at $650, (Grossmann had recently been receiving $800 for his two offices), $400 from the Kirchenblatt and the rest from the Synodalkasse. It may be noted that Deindoerfer was authorized to have the synod represented by a pastor who was to conduct a service at the Columbian World's Fair, p. 77, but a note written in his handwriting states that he declined to do so "als nicht fuer die Kirche wuerdig."

He lived to see the anniversary, but stricken seriously ill shortly before the convention of 1904 met, was unable to attend it. His resignation was accepted and Richter, who had already succeeded him as editor, was elected to the presidency.[177] Deindoerfer thus was the only one of the founders who lived to see the fiftieth anniversary and that occasion, celebrated with joy, also marked the departure from active participation in synodical affairs of the sole survivor of the events celebrated.[178]

---

[177] Synodalbericht 1902, 16, 17, 122, 130; 1904, 18, 21, 103. Deindoerfer did not actually resign as president in 1902, but stated that he would serve until 1904, as he had been requested to do from many sides. He did resign as editor of the Kirchenblatt, because of his age and unpleasant experiences. He referred to certain criticisms, as he had indeed once before resigned that office, because of criticism directed against his stand on the Council when that issue, as will be noted, again arose in the eighties. He was voted the full salary he had been drawing, but apparently declined to accept it. Both in 1902 and in 1904 his resignations were accepted with regret and with votes of thanks and in 1904 he was again voted his full salary, whatever that may have been, as pension. He recovered from his illness and lived until 1907. Richter was granted a salary of $1,200, $600 from each treasury. It may be noted that the Southern District had given consideration to a salaried district presidency in 1901, but had not acted, K. B., XLIV, 23.

[178] Two guests of honor from Germany attended the anniversary celebration at the convention, M. Deinzer, successor of his brother who had come to America in 1879 for Neuendettelsau, and E. Pamperrien, who represented the Mecklenburg Gotteskasten. G. C. Berkemeier represented the General Council. Another representative of the Gotteskasten, in Hanover was unable to come and sent a letter of congratulation and a gift. Pastor Janssen of Strackholt also sent a letter. Neuendettelsau was still contributing $600 annually to the seminary and to home missions, Synodalbericht 1904, 5-6, 14.

Doctrinal controversy with Missouri continued in this period, but the older controversies were overshadowed by the great struggle over predestination. It has been noted that this question was controverted in the seventies, but that Iowa had taken the position that individuals in the Missouri Synod, rather than the synod were involved. By 1880, however, the Missouri Synod had adopted or approved Walther's position, that aside from the general divine will that all men should be saved, there was a particular unalterable election of those who would retain faith to the end of life, which was not only divine foreknowledge and which did not depend upon something good in sinful man, not even upon a foreseen faith. On the contrary, predestination was a cause of the salvation of the elect. Christian believers must accept the fact that the Scriptural revelations on predestination contained mysteries unfathomable by human reason and should strive to attain certainty in regard to their election from God's revealed will.[179] The Iowa Synod rejected this interpretation of predestination and maintained that the universal will of God to extend saving grace to all sinners was not conditioned or restricted by a particular election, occasioning the salvation of only a portion of them. The Missouri position was called a fundamental Calvinist error.[180]

---

[179] The writer makes no pretense of having examined the voluminous literature on the predestination controversy in theological magazines and pamphlets, where it was chiefly carried on. Missouri's popular organ presented Walther's contentions for the laity in a series of thirteen theses with comments and citations from which the summary given has been drawn. See Lutheraner, XXXVI, 2, 11; 3, 19-22; 4, 25-28; 5, 33-34; 6, 41-43; 7, 52-54; 8, 58-60; 9, 65-67.

The predestination controversy occasioned no Missouri trend in the Iowa Synod, consequently though theological discussion was carried on extensively in pamphlets and magazines, it did not carry disturbance into the synod itself. On the contrary, as had already been foreshadowed in earlier statements, the synod now took the position that Missouri had departed from the Lutheran conception of Scriptural truth and that, apart from incidental theological problems, the controversy did not involve open questions. This meant both that the Missouri position could not be tolerated within the synod and that the synod no longer strove to obtain church fellowship with Missouri.[181] Although the earlier controversies were not resolved, they tended to sink into the background, the two synods maintaining their conflicting viewpoints, but being more concerned with the new controversy than with continued airings of those of the past. Friendship, of course, was impossible under these circumstances and the period saw no attempt at renewed discussions for the purpose of drawing closer together.[182]

---

[180] Iowa's position was defined in a set of twenty-one theses which were presented to the district conventions of 1880, of which there were but two at that time. They were adopted unanimously by the Western District and referred by the Eastern to its two conferences, which subsequently announced their agreement. See K. B. XXIII, 15, 113-4 (which brings the theses), 17, 135; 20, 159; 21, 167. Discussions of theses 1-12 are in 16, 123-5; 17, 132-4; 18, 137-9; 20, 154-6; 22, 169-70; 23, 179-80, the discussion was carried no further, all the positive theses and four of those rejecting Missouri's position being discussed.

[181] The convention of 1882 discussed seven theses by S. Fritschel (the twenty-one of 1880 were by G. Fritschel) which defined the point of controversy and named several fundamental Missouri errors which were rejected. The theses are printed in Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 228-30. The convention also approved a pamphlet by G. Fritschel, Traktat von der Gnadenwahl, which was subsequently disseminated widely. K. B. XXV, 14, 105-6, reported on these actions, but noted that synod found time to discuss only six of the seven theses.

The predestination controversy led to a schism in the Synodical Conference, the Ohio Synod withdrawing among others, and a number of dissidents from other bodies of the Conference, among them Klindworth, withdrew and joined Ohio. After this synod again occupied an independent position, attempts were made to establish church fellowship with Iowa. Though Iowa hardly considered a colloquy necessary, Ohio suggested such a discussion which was finally arranged in 1893.[183] The colloquy was held in Michigan City in July 1893 and resulted in a series of statements expressing agreement on church, ministry, position toward the symbols, open questions, chiliasm and anti-Christ, and predestination and conversion. The colloquents proposed that when both synods had recognized the agreement it should result in altar and pulpit fellowship and in synodical arrangements avoiding competition in missions and refusal to establish opposition altars.[184]

---

[182] Controversy over other points did not rest entirely. After a Missouri attack, G. Fritschel presented the differences in a series of articles which appeared posthumously in K. Z. and were reprinted subsequently in a pamphlet, Die Unterscheidungslehren der Synoden von Iowa und Missouri, Waverly, 1893.

[183] The author's incomplete research on this topic has yielded little on the genesis of this colloquy. Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 232-7, describes the developments. There had never been a real controversy over doctrinal questions between the Synods. After Ohio's withdrawal from the Synodical Conference an informal discussion in 1882 in which leaders of both synods took part, resulted in agreement on doctrines of faith. From Iowa's point of view that sufficed for church fellowship. In 1887, however, Ohio proposed a colloquy, the Ausschuss agreed, but expressed surprise that Ohio considered it necessary and took the occasion to protest Ohio's acceptance of Klindworth. No reply was received, but in 1892 it was reported to Grossmann that Ohio members believed that Iowa had laid down unacceptable conditions, Synodalbericht 1893, 16-17. This source explains that Grossmann then wrote to President Loy objecting that Iowa

The agreement, however, aroused opposition in both synods. The western conferences in the Ohio Synod objected particularly, with the result that the convention of that body meeting in the next year, tabled the matter.[185] In consequence Iowa

---

had not laid down conditions at all and stating that it was still ready to proceed. Further exchanges led to agreement on a date and to appointment of colloquents, Loy, Allwardt, Ernst, Th. Mees, Meiser, J. W. Stellhorn for Ohio, Deindoerfer, S. Fritschel, W. Proehl, Richter, Bredow, Caselmann for Iowa. Deindoerfer declined and Th. Meier and Lutz were substituted. The convention approved, p. 20.

[184] K. B. XXXVI, 17, 133-4. The agreement is also reprinted in Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 234-6. The doctrine on Sunday in the symbols was declared not to be an open question, but the Iowa colloquents reserved the question which long had been in controversy in a separate statement. The statement on opposition altars declared that the synods would direct their members moving to other communities to the churches of the other.

[185] K. B. XXXVI, 18, 142, brought an editorial statement expressing agreement in the main, but reserving objections on some of the statements on chiliasm, the ministry and the anti-Christ. In XXXVII, 16, 126, 127, it was reported that the Wisconsin District of Ohio (composed largely of pastors who had left Missouri and Wisconsin Synods, including Klindworth) had adopted a resolution asking the Ohio convention to take no action, because the agreement was merely verbal, subject to differing interpretations by the two parties and in part also expressing objection to union with Iowa (which had not been proposed). The Minnesota District took similar action.

took no action at its next convention in 1896.[186] Since establishment of church fellowship had been the purpose of the colloquy, and since it had been made dependent in the Michigan City agreement upon official ratification by both synods, the result of the failure to ratify was that church fellowship was held in abeyance. Many individual members of both bodies seem to have regretted this result. The historian of the Iowa Synod concluded that since Iowa had been willing to extend church fellowship to Ohio without a colloquy, the cause of its denial was the unwillingness of strong elements in Ohio to recognize Iowa as a confessionally Lutheran church. The negotiations were not resumed during this period.[187]

In 21, 192, the tabling was reported and dissatisfaction with the theses on chiliasm given as the reason. It may be noted that several of the Ohio colloquents had formerly belonged to the Synodical Conference.

[186] K. B. XXXIX, 17, 203, makes no direct reference to the failure to act, but refers to dissension in Ohio caused by the position of its Wisconsin District and to opposition of the latter to union. The editor pointed out that union had not been in question, only church fellowship which Iowa on its part had not questioned. He referred to Klindworth's influence in Wisconsin as a factor in the attitude of the district.

[187] Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 237, reported in 1896 that Ohio had in 1896 refused to take the matter up again and that Iowa had taken no action at all. He maintained that Iowa was treating Ohio as a sister synod and that members of both synods practiced church fellowship in various places. In 1904, however, in Synode von Iowa, 71-2, he did not mention instances of church fellowship and wrote that Ohio did not recognize Iowa as truly Lutheran and that its officials acted in this spirit on occasion. A resentment between the lines may indicate an attitude which made resumption of negotiations difficult while Deindoerfer remained at the helm in Iowa. Peter and Schmidt, Geschichte der Synode Ohio, 339-46, discusses this episode,

Relationships with the General Council followed the established pattern for a number of years. The struggle over the Galesburg Rule divided that body, Iowa delegates attended its sessions, now held biennially, and joined forces with the elements which contended for its universal recognition and application. The Council, however, would not go farther than to recognize the principles of that rule as scriptural and confessional, while also recognizing admissibility of exceptions. The theological professors came to feel that the synod could now safely assume full membership and won a measure of support, but opposition to such a course remained strong. The convention of 1885 discussed a resolution to join, submitted by the Southern District, at some length.[188] The question

---

maintaining that Ohio was justified in asking for a colloquy and in accepting Klindworth, and that opposition within the Ohio Synod after 1893 made it inadvisable to press for immediate union. Ohio may have been thinking of church fellowship as a preliminary step toward union, but Iowa at that time gave no indication of a desire to go beyond church fellowship.

[188] *K. B.* XXVIII, 2, 9-10, mentioned the resolution of the district and asked a number of questions. Was the Council vigorously proceeding against unionist practice? Was the synod able to give adequate support to Council projects, such as its foreign mission? Could the synod afford to be adequately represented at conventions? What concrete benefits would the synod derive from membership? Was it wise to enter into association with the predominating English-speaking element in the Council? The writer, who was probably Deindoerfer, was not enthusiastic on most points and definitely doubtful on the first one. Since the seminary was then at Mendota it seems probable that the influence of the professors, who were usually the delegates to Council sessions, and who had been favorably inclined toward membership since the adoption of the Akron rule, was gaining adherents in the Southern District. Deindoerfer, apparently with strong backing in the Eastern District, seems to have led the opposition. When his

seems to have been brought to a head by some degree of dissatisfaction within the Council over Iowa's anomalous position, through which the synod was able to exercise a strong influence within that body without assuming membership. Sentiments expressed in certain Council publications were to the effect that Iowa ought at length to make up its mind one way or the other.

The convention of 1885 heard presentations pro and con and discussed resolutions submitted by a floor committee. These reasserted doctrinal and confessional unity and noted progress in the Council in regard to practice through adoption of the Galesburg Rule. Through that action the original confessional objections on the point of practice had been removed, so that the question of membership was not solely a question of ecclesiastical suitability and convenience. They also noted with satisfaction that protests within the Council against contrary practice gave testimony of unity in faith and confessional position. They finally declared in favor of membership, if the synod could cheerfully and enthusiastically agree upon this step. The convention adopted the former points, but substituted another resolution for the last one. This declared that since opinions in the synod were still divided upon the point of membership and that since such a question should not be decided by majority vote,

---

editorial attitude was questioned, Deindoerfer resigned his editorship.

the synod would continue in its present status until such time as approximate unanimity could be attained.[189]

The General Council accepted the decision and passed a resolution in 1886 conceding continuance of the status quo to the Iowa Synod and expressing the hope that before too long the synod might be able to reach a decision to exchange it for full membership.[190] The hope was not fulfilled, on the contrary the synod in succeeding conventions failed to appoint delegates to Council conventions and the relationship became inactive. In 1902, however, the Council appointed a delegate to represent it at the Iowa convention at Dixon, Illinois, of that year. The synod thereupon resolved to resume regular appointment of delegates to Council conventions and also invited the Council to send a delegate to the anniversary convention of 1904, which was done.[191]

---

[189] Synodalbericht 1885, 35-7. A paper advocating membership had at Grossmann's request been submitted by Pastor G. Meier and another opposing it by Kroenke. The resolutions as adopted are also printed in Deindoerfer, Geschichte, 239-40.

[190] The resolution is reprinted Ibid., 240. The Council also appointed Dr. Spaeth as delegate to the next Iowa general convention, to communicate its resolution orally. Spaeth in 1888 was not able, however, to attend in person, but forwarded the resolution with a statement of regret on this point, Synodalbericht 1888, 78.

[191] K. B. XLV, 20, 235. Deindoerfer, Synode von Iowa, 69, approved these measures, but indicated that continued toleration of laxity in practice in the Council left the basic situation unchanged.

In its second quarter century the Iowa Synod developed along the lines which had been marked out during the preceding period, without fundamental change. It remained an independent body representative of its Richtung. Experiencing rapid growth it became able to maintain itself by its own efforts and, while maintaining cordial relationships with its German friends, to become independent of their aid. Its growth necessitated organizational changes and enabled it greatly to develop the scope of its undertakings and activities. The synod did not experience grave internal disturbances and synodical consciousness on the part of its clergy showed improvement. It did not, however, succeed in imbuing the rank and file of its laity with a strong sense of synodical loyalty and a zealous interest in its activities. As a result, it still had difficulty in maintaining a full program of synodical undertakings with a scope which it deemed desirable, although growing numerical strength enabled it to make progress in this direction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

A. MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

"Chronik der Synode von Iowa 1854-1893." A chronological record of significant developments and important events, kept by J. Deindoerfer through 1870 and by J. List thereafter. It is in the archives of the American Lutheran Church housed in Wartburg Seminary at Dubuque, Iowa.

"Deindoerfer Papers." The title given by the writer to an uncatalogued accumulation of letters and papers, chiefly correspondence addressed to Deindoerfer during his presidency, 1894-1904, but also containing earlier materials, including letters of some importance as well as personal records and papers. When consulted these papers were in the possession of Mr. A. Engelbrecht, Waverly, Iowa, who retains the personal records, but the official materials have since been given to the archives at Dubuque and will presumably be filed there with the Iowa Synod Documents.

"Fritschel Family Correspondence." Letters from members of the Fritschel family to each other, chiefly from Sigmund and Gottfried Fritschel before the latter came to America in 1857. The title was supplied by the writer. In possession of Miss Esther Fritschel, Dubuque, Iowa.

"Iowa Synod Documents." The title given by the writer to several files of documentary material in the archives at Dubuque. The bulk of the collection consists of correspondence addressed to Grossmann as president, chiefly up to 1879. Some documents date back into the forties and some forward into the eighties. Papers of various other types, such as parochial and visitation reports, as well as a few early financial records, etc., are also included.

"Iowa Synod Financial Records." Books of the synodical and other treasuries in the archives at Dubuque. They are far from complete and only a few scattered records relate to periods before 1879. Most of the early records do not seem to be extant, but some additional materials can be found in the "Iowa Synod Documents," the "Deindoerfer Papers" and the "S. Fritschel Papers." The title was also supplied by the writer.

"Loehe Papers." Typewritten copies of a few letters written by Loehe and of a much larger number addressed to him by various correspondents in America. They are in the library of the University of Chicago at Chicago and are catalogued as: "Letters relating to German Lutheran Settlements in Michigan sponsored by Wilhelm Loehe. c. 1845-1866." The collection also contains several reels of film recording letters, Loehe - Wucherer, 1841-1866.

"Protokollbuch." The title given by the writer to a volume in the archives at Dubuque in which are bound the minutes of the ministerial conferences, 1854-1862, and those of the Ministerialausschuss, 1859-1864. They appear to be complete for the latter body. Several additional sessions of the ministerial conference were held for which no minutes are extant.

"Sigmund Fritschel Correspondence." The writer has given this title to a collection of letters addressed to Sigmund Fritschel chiefly from correspondents in Russia. It is in possession of Mrs. M. Fritschel, Dubuque, Iowa.

"Sigmund Fritschel Papers." A collection of miscellaneous documents, personal records, lectures, sermons, papers relating to synodical and intersynodical affairs and some letters. They are in possession of the writer at Waverly, Iowa.

"Tagebuch von H. Fr. Dietz." The title found on the fly leaf of the first of three small volumes. Entries are arranged by months and extend from April 1853 to July 1893. They relate to personal affairs and pastoral activities, with occasional references to synodical affairs. In the archives at Dubuque.

"Tagebuch von S. Fritschel ueber die erste Zeit in Dubuque." The title was added by another hand in pencil. The volume is in the archives at Dubuque and contains entries for 1854 and 1855. Various entries of another kind, such as sermon outlines are on later pages. Much of this diary was published in Kirchliche Mittheilungen.

"Toledo Papers." The title given by the writer to letters and other papers relating to the Toledo controversy in 1859 in possession of Prof. E. W. Matzner in Dubuque.

B. PRINTED OFFICIAL REPORTS

1. Synodical Conventions

Buffalo Synod

Convention reports appeared under the title: Synodal-Brief von der Synode der aus Preussen eingewanderten lutherischen Kirche with a numerical prefix indicating the number of the convention. Vierter 1853; Fuenfter 1856; Sechster 1859.

General Council

General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. First Convention, Fort Wayne, Indiana, November 20-26, A. D. 1867.

Iowa Synod

To 1864 reports appeared under the title: *Synodal-Bericht der deutschen evangelisch lutherischen Synode von Iowa.* The specific convention was identified by adding the year in which it met. Reports appeared for the conventions of 1858, 1861, and 1864. Beginning in 1875 the reports bore the title: *Verhandlungen der dreizehnten Versammlung der deutschen evangelisch lutherischen Synode von Iowa u. a. Staaten*, the numeral changing in each title. Place and date were also indicated and later *deutschen* was omitted and *allgemeinen* or *Delegaten* were inserted before *Synode.* Reports were printed for the conventions of 1875, 1882, 1885, 1888, 1890, 1896, 1899, 1902, 1904.

No reports were printed for 1854, 1855, 1856, 1860, 1867, 1869, 1871, 1873, 1879. Reports on these conventions, based on the official minutes can be found in "Chronik." Beginning in 1858 the *Kirchenblatt* printed popular reports which after 1860 are reasonably full and informative except for the conventions of 1867 and 1879 when printed reports were ordered, but not published. *Kirchliche Mittheilungen*, 1856, 6 and 7, printed sections of the minutes for the convention of 1856. Official minutes were kept but are not extant. "Iowa Synod Documents" contains a report on the first convention of 1854 and lists of resolutions adopted, entitled *Zusammenstellungen* for the conventions of 1864, 1867, 1868 and 1873.

Iowa District Synods

Printed reports appeared under two title forms, *e. g.*, *Verhandlungen der siebenten Versammlung des Westlichen Distrikts der Synode von Iowa und andern Staaten*, and *Bericht ueber die achte Versammlung des Westlichen Distrikts der evangelisch-lutherischen Synode von Iowa und andern Staaten.* With slight variations of wording all districts used the one or other of these forms usually consistently, though as the examples show, the Western District used both. The different conventions were identified through changes in numerals, and place and date of the meeting were also given.

No printed reports were issued before 1887. There are thus none for the original Western District as established in 1873 and none for the Eastern District until its 10th convention in 1887. Data on the first conventions of both districts in 1874 are scanty. "Chronik" contains a few data and the *Kirchenblatt* brought a brief report on the convention of the Eastern District. After 1875 popular reports on the district conventions regularly appeared in the *Kirchenblatt* and important decisions and resolutions were recorded in "Chronik." The printed reports run in series beginning with the following years:

Dakota District, 1st Session, 1891
Eastern District, 10th Session, 1887
Northern District, 5th Session, 1887
Southern District, 4th Session, 1887
Western District, 7th Session, 1889
Wisconsin District, 1st Session, 1891

The Dakota District had no report printed on its 6th session in 1898, but a comprehensive report appeared in the *Kirchenblatt*, which continued to bring brief, popular reports when printed reports were issued. The writer has not seen printed reports for the 11th and 13th sessions of the Eastern District, 1889 and 1892, nor for the 5th session of the Southern District, 1889. A comprehensive newspaper report of the 6th session of the Western District in 1887 exists. In some cases the minute books of the districts are in the archives in Dubuque.

Texas Synod

Reports appeared under the following title form: *Verhandlungen der 42. Versammlung der Ersten Deutschen Evang.-Lutherischen Synode in Texas*. Place and date of the convention are also given. The series is continuous after the 42nd convention in 1894, except that no report appears to have been printed for the 49th convention in 1901 which was a special session. The 48th report was issued in 1900 and the 50th in 1901.

2. Other Sessions

Bericht ueber die auf Anlass der Schrift Past. Klindworth's "Die traurigen Zustaende in der Iowa-Synode" veranstaltete Untersuchung durch die vom Praesidium der Iowa-Synode ernannte synodale Committee, Mendota, 1876.

Oeffentliches Colloquium abgehalten vom 13. bis zum 19. November 1867, in der Ev. Luth. Dreieinigkeitskirche zu Milwaukee, Wisc., zwischen den Vertretern der Ev. Luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio und anderen Staaten und der Ev. Lutherischen Synode von Iowa, Milwaukee, 1868.

Report of the First Lutheran Conference on Mission Among Israel. Held at Chicago, Illinois, May 7th and 8th 1901, Chicago, 1901.

C. PERIODICALS

Blaetter aus dem Waisenhause, Andrew, Iowa, 1871. The paper subsequently served both orphanages and the title was changed to Blaetter aus den Waisenhaeusern. It was issued until 1899 when it was replaced by Jugendblatt. No complete file could be located.

Correspondenzblatt der Gesellschaft fuer innere Mission nach dem Sinne der lutherischen Kirche, Noerdlingen 1850-. After 1854 this publication was accompanied by Anzeiger des Correspondenzblattes which published receipts and was also issued with Kirchliche Mittheilungen.

Freimunds Kirchlich-Politisches Wochenblatt fuer Stadt und Land, Noerdlingen, 1855-.

Jugendblatt, Chicago, 1900-1936.

Kirchen-Blatt der evangelisch-lutherischen Synode von Iowa, various places, 1858-.

Kirchliche Mittheilungen aus und ueber Nord-Amerika, Noerdlingen, 1843-1866. Neue Folge, 1869-.

Kirchliche Zeitschrift, Mendota, Illinois, and Dubuque, Iowa, 1876-1943.

Kirchliches Informatorium. Ein geistliches Lehrblatt fuer alle Christen, Buffalo, 1850-1867.

Lehre und Wehre Theologisches und kirchlich-zeitgeschichtliches Monatsblatt, St. Louis, 1855-.

Lutheraner, Der, St. Louis, 1844-.

Lutherische Zeitschrift. Issued under this title November 1854, through the year 1855 as Vol. I. Thereafter it was issued as, Lutherische Zeitschrift, Jugendfreund und Missionsblaetter. Vereinigtes Blatt fuer Familie Schule und Kirche, beginning over again with Vol. I, Allentown, Pennsylvania, 1856-.

Missionsblatt, Nuernberg, 1859-1861.

Melsunger Missionsblatt, Melsungen, 1871-.

Theologische Monatshefte Eine Zeitschrift zur Eroerterung wichtiger Lehr-und Amtsfragen im Sinne der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche, Allentown, Pennsylvania, 1868-1873.

Sonntagsblatt, Noerdlingen, 1854-.

D. UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS

Buehring, P. H., "The Beginnings of Lutheranism in Ohio," University of Chicago, M. A., 1923.

Fritschel, Erwin G., "A History of the Indian Mission of the Lutheran Iowa Synod," Wartburg Seminary, B. D., 1940.

Fritschel, Werner K. T., "Formation and Development of the Iowa Synod 1854-1867," University of Minnesota, M. A., 1930.

Greenholt, Homer Reginald, "A Study of Wilhelm Loehe, His Colonies and the Lutheran Indian Missions in the Saginaw Valley of Michigan," University of Chicago, Ph. D., 1937.

Park, Folkert Alvin, "The Early History of the Iowa Synod," University of Chicago, M. A., 1931.

E. PAMPHLETS

Blaetter fuer aeussere und innere Mission im Sinne der lutherischen Kirche ausgesandt aus dem Grossherzogthum Hessen. Nr. 6. Die von Neuendettelsau ausgehende Mission unter den ausgewanderten Deutschen Nordamerikas, Darmstadt, 1866.

Deindoerfer, J., *Denkschrift verfasst zur Gedaechtnisfeier der vor zehn Jahren geschehenen Gruendung der deutschen ev. luth. Synode von Iowa. Am 24. August 1864 zu St. Sebald a. Q.*, Ansbach

Deindoerfer, J., *Denkschrift zur Fuenfundzwanzigjaehrigen Jubelfeier der Ev. Luth. Synode von Iowa u. a. Staaten zu Maxfield, Iowa i. J. 1879*, Defiance, Ohio.

Deindoerfer, J., *Denkschrift zur 50jaehrigen Jubelfeier der Evang.-Luth. Synode von Iowa und andern Staaten*, Chicago, 1904.

Fritschel, Gottfried, *Die Lehre der Missouri Synode von der Praedestination*, 1883.

Fritschel, Sigmund, *Die Unterscheidungslehren der Synoden von Iowa und Missouri*, Waverly, Iowa, 1893.

Fritschel, Gottfried and Sigmund, *Iowa und Missouri, eine Verteidigung der Lehrstellung der Iowa-Synode gegenueber den Angriffen des Herrn Prof. Schmidt*, 1878.

Grabau, Joh. A., *Die Lehre von der Kirche, wie dieselbe von der lutherischen Synode von Buffalo in ihren Synodalbriefen bezeugt ist, in ihrer Uebereinstimmung mit der heiligen Schrift, den Symbolen der Kirche, und dem Zeugniss Dr. Lutheri und anderer treuer luth. Lehrer*, Buffalo, 1880.

Grabau, Joh. A., *Lebenslauf des Ehrwuerdigen J. An. A. Grabau weiland Pastor der lutherischen Dreifaltigkeits-Kirche zu Buffalo und Senior Ministerii der Buffalo-Synode*, Buffalo, 1879.

Gutachten der Dorpater theol. Facultaet ueber die von der deutschen evang.-luth. Synode von Iowa in Nord-Amerika ihr vorgelegten Fragen, den kirchlichen Lehrconsensus betreffend. (No imprint, but undoubtedly printed at Wartburg, probably in 1867.)

In Memoriam. Zum Gedaechtnis des selig entschlafenen Gottfried Leonhard Wilhelm Fritschel, Doktor der Theologie und Professor am theologischen Seminar Wartburg zu Mendota, Ills. Lebenslauf und die am Sarge gehaltenen Reden., Waverly, 1889.

Klindworth, J., *Die traurigen Zustaende in der Synode von Iowa. Eine Beleuchtung der neuesten Vorgaenge und des sog. Synodal-Berichts*, St. Louis, 1875.

Klindworth, J., *Zu einem Zeugniss ueber sie: Eine persoenliche Rechtfertigung gegen Iowaische Verdaechtigungen.*

Loehe, Wilhelm, *Zuruf aus der Heimat*, 1845.

Reden und Ansprachen gehalten bei der Trauerfeier fuer Professor D. Sigmund Fritschel in Dubuque, Iowa, und Mendota, Ill., Waverly, Iowa.

Schieferdecker, G. A., *Geschichte der ersten deutschen lutherischen Ansiedlung in Altenburg, Perry Co., Missouri. Mit besonderer Beruecksichtigung der dortigen kirchlichen Bewegungen geschrieben zur 25jaehrigen Gedaechtnisfeier der Gruendung Altenburgs*, Wartburg, 1864.

Schieferdecker, G. A., *Mein Austritt aus der Synode von Iowa*, St. Louis, 1875.

Schmidt, F.A., *Die iowaischen Missverstaendnisse und Bemaentelungen*, St. Louis, 1876.

Stenographisch aufgezeichnetes Colloquium der Vertreter der Synode von Iowa und der von Missouri, Ohio u. a. Staaten, gehalten vom 13.-19. Nov. in Milwaukee, Wis., verabfasst und veroeffentlicht von J. P. Beyer, Pastor, Chicago, 1868.

Wahrheitsgetreue Schilderung der Vorgaenge in Toledo bei dem Uebertritt der dortigen Gemeinde von der Synode Buffalo zu der von Iowa und eine kurze Darlegung der Verhandlungen die zwischen beiden Ministerien dadurch veranlasst wurden, Toledo, 1860.

Wartburg College. (No imprint, but published in Clinton in 1893.)

Zuruf der Kirche an ihre zerstreuten Glaubensgenossen, Wartburg.

F. PRINTED CONSTITUTIONS

Constitution der Ersten Deutschen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Synode von Texas, Brenham, 1892.

Constitution der Evangelisch Lutherischen Synode von Iowa und anderen Staaten, Defiance, n. d. A later edition, Waverly, Iowa, 1891, is revised and spells the title *Konstitution*.

Constitution des Unterstuetzungsvereins der Deutschen Lutherischen Synode von Iowa und anderen Staaten, 1885.

Gemeindeordnung der evangl. lutherischen Synode von Iowa, Madison, 1860.

Konstitution, Geschaeftsordnung und Ordnungeregeln der zur Ev.-Luth. Synode von Iowa und anderen Staaten gehoerenden Oestlichen Illinois Konferenz, Waverly, 1894.

Konstitution des Waisenvereins zu Andrew, Jackson County, Iowa, Waverly, 1897.

Statuten der Gesellschaft fuer gemeinsame Werke der Barmherzigkeit im Sinne der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche in Nordamerika.

Statuten fuer die Pfarrwitwenkasse der Ev. Luth. Synode von Iowa u. a. Staaten, Waverly, 1888.

German Evangelical Lutheran Mutual Fire Insurance Association, Waverly. (This pamphlet may be appended here, though it is a prospectus rather than a constitution.)

The synodical constitution of the Iowa Synode listed above is a revised edition of the second synodical constitution. So far as the writer has been able to determine the constitution of 1864 was not printed separately, though it was printed in *Synodalbericht 1864* and, most accessibly, in Deindoerfer, *Geschichte*, 89-92, and also recorded in "Chronik." Printing of the original version of the second constitution provisionally adopted in 1873 was ordered, but the writer has seen no copy of a separate print. It can also be found in Deindoerfer, *Geschichte*, 170-175, as well as in "Chronik." The revisions of 1879 are noted in "Chronik." The printed editions listed contain later revisions.

The listed *Gemeindeordnung* is the revised version of 1860 which also is printed more accessibly in Deindoerfer, *Geschichte*, 82-87. The original version of 1855 is in "Chronik." Drafts for a new constitution for congregations were published *Kirchenblatt* XVI, 20, 158; XIX, 19, 151; 20, 160; XX, 2, 9. After formal adoption during the third period this constitution was also printed as a pamphlet as well as in Deindoerfer, *Geschichte*, 285-291.

G. PRINTED CONGREGATIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL HISTORIES

A large and growing number of these came into existence when it became customary to print historical sketches on the occasion of 25th or later anniversaries. They are of uneven quality and are usually concerned with local developments. The following list contains only those which were consulted on some point.

Diamond Jubilee St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Dubuque, Iowa 1854-1929, Dubuque.

Diamond Jubilee St. John's Ev. Lutheran Congregation, Madison, Wisconsin 1856-1931.

Diamond Jubilee Celebration Salem Lutheran Church Toledo, Ohio 1842-1917.

Dilges, J., Schaffnit, F., Graening, H., Blessin, G., *Festschrift zum Goldenen Jubilaeum des Waisenhauses zu Waverly, Iowa 1863-1913*.

Heinecke, E., *Kurzgefasste Geschichte der deutschen evangelisch-lutherischen Immanuels-Gemeinde zu Frankentrost, Blumfield Township, Saginaw Co., Mich.*, Saginaw, 1897.

Mayer, E. A., *Geschichte der evangelisch-lutherischen St. Lorenz-Gemeinde U. A. C. zu Frankenmuth, Mich.*, St. Louis, 1895.

Poppen, S., *Goldenes Jubilaeum. Geschichte des luth. Waisenhauses zu Toledo, Ohio, 1860-1910,* Toledo.

Trinklein, J. J., *Rueckblick auf die ersten fuenfzig Jahre des Bestehens der evangelisch-lutherischen St. Pauls-Gemeinde U. A. K. zu Frankenlust, Mich.*, 1898.

H. ALMANACS

Der lutherische Kalender fuer das Jahr 1857 nach der Geburt unsern Herrn und Heilandes Jesu Christ, welches ein gemeines Jahr von 365 Tagen ist, Allentown, Penn. Issued annually by S. Brobst with appropriate changes in the title for year date and for leap years.

Wartburg Kalender der Ev. Luth. Synode von Iowa und andern Staaten Fuer das Jahr unsers Herrn 1887, Waverly, Iowa. Issued annually thereafter, but in later years in Chicago.

I. EARLY SERVICE PUBLICATIONS

Fibel. Various editions exist, the earliest copy seen by the writer does not give author, date or publication data. It may not have been the first edition published at Andrew in 1872 or 1873.

Geistliche Lieder fuer Schule und Kirche, Wartburg, 1863.

Kirchenbuch fuer Evangelisch-Lutherische Gemeinden, General Council, 1877.

Kleine Katechismus Dr. Martin Luthers mit einer Auswahl von beweisenden und erlaeuternden Spruechen aus der heiligen Schrift fuer die Evangelisch-Lutherische Jugend, Der. While an edition was printed at Wartburg circa 1864, the earliest copy seen was the 19th edition, Chicago, 1909.

Loehe, Wilhelm, *Agende fuer christliche Gemeinden des lutherischen Bekenntnisses*, 2nd edition, Noerdlingen, 1853, Part II, 1859. The first edition had been issued in 1844 and does not seem to have been used in America. A third edition was issued in 1884.

Loehe, Wilhelm, *Haus-Schul-und Kirchenbuch fuer Christen des lutherischen Bekenntnisses, Erster Theil*, Stuttgart, 1845. (The first part was a catechism with questions and answers and there were four other parts.) Subsequently the Iowa Synod published *Wilhelm Loehe's Fragen und Antworten zu den fuenf Hauptstuecken des kleinen Katechismus Dr. M. Luthers*. The earliest edition seen of this republication was dated 1887, Waverly.

Unverfaelschter Liedersegen, Gesangbuch fuer Kirchen, Schulen und Haeuser, Berlin, 1873. The earliest edition seen.

J. BOOKS

1. Printed Source Materials

Fritschel, Geo. J., *Quellen und Dokumente zur Geschichte und Lehrstellung der ev.-luth. Synode von Iowa u. a. Staaten*, Chicago.

2. Memoirs and Biographies

Augustin, A. F., *In the Master's Vineyard: Serious and Entertaining Sketches from the Life of a Lutheran Pastor*, Wartburg Publ. House, Chicago, 1923.

Bredow, P., *Erinnerungen aus dem Leben und Wirken eines amerikanisch-lutherischen Pastors*, Privately printed, Waterloo, Iowa, 1904.

Deinzer, J., *Wilhelm Loehes Leben aus seinem schriftlichen Nachlass zusammengestellt*, 3 vols., C. Bertelsmann, Guetersloh, Vol. II, 1880, Vol. III, 1892; Vol. I, 2nd edition, G. Loehe, Nuernberg, 1874.

Gruber, J. L., *Erinnerungen an Professor C. F. W. Walther und seine Zeit*, Geo. J. Fritschel, editor, privately printed.

Spaeth, A., *S. Fritschel, D. D., A Short Biography*, Wartburg Publ. House, Chicago, 1901.

3. Treatises

Dallmann, Wm., Dau, W. H. T., Engelder, Th., Walther and the Church, Concordia Publ. House, St. Louis, 1938.

Kraushaar, Chr. O., Verfassungsformen der Lutherischen Kirche Amerikas, C. Bertelsmann, Guetersloh, 1911.

Loehe, Wilhelm, Aphorismen ueber die neutestamentlichen Aemter und ihr Verhaeltniss zur Kirche. Zur Verfassungsfrage der Kirche, Raw, Nuernberg, 1849.

Loehe, Wilhelm, Kirche und Amt. Neue Aphorismen, Blaesing, Erlangen, 1851.

Spaude, Paul W., The Lutheran Church under American Influence: A Historico-Philosphical Interpretation of the Church in its Relation to Various Modifying Forces in the United States, Burlington, Iowa, Lutheran Literary Board, 1943.

Walther, C. F. W., Die Stimme unserer Kirche in der Frage von Kirche und Amt. Eine Sammlung von Zeugnissen ueber diese Frage aus den Bekenntnissschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche und aus den Privatschriften rechtglaeubiger Lehrer derselben, Deichert, Erlangen 1852; 4th ed., Hermann, Zwickau, 1894.

4. General Histories of American Lutheranism

Fritschel, Geo. J., Geschichte der Lutherischen Kriche in Amerika auf Grund von Prof. Dr. H. E. Jacobs "History of the Evang. Luth. Church in the United States" bearbeitet, 2 vols. Vol. I, Geschichte der Entwicklung der lutherischen Kirche in Amerika bis zu Muehlenbergs Tode. Vol. II, Geschichte der Entwicklung der lutherischen Kirche von Muehlenbergs Tode bis zur Gegenwart, C. Bertelsmann, Guetersloh, 1896, 1897.

Jacobs, H. E., A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States, Vol. IV in the American Church History series, 6th edition, Scribner, New York, 1912.

Jørgensen, Alfred Th., Fleisch, F., Wentz, Abdel Ross, editors, The Lutheran Churches of the World, Augsburg Publ. House, Minneapolis.

Lenker, J. N., Lutherans in All Lands: The Wonderful Works of God, 4th revised and enlarged edition, 2 vols. in one, Milwaukee, 1894.

Neve, J. L., A Brief History of the Lutheran Church in America, 2nd revised and enlarged edition, 1916. A third revised edition appeared in 1934. The volume also appeared in German as, *Kurzgefasste Geschichte der lutherischen Kirche Amerikas*, German Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa, 1915.

Wentz, Abdel Ross, *The Lutheran Church in American History*, 2nd revised edition, United Lutheran Publ. House, Philadelphia, 1932.

Wolf, Edmund Jacob, *The Lutherans in America: A Story of Struggle, Progress, Influence and Marvelous Growth*, J. A. Hill, New York, 1889.

5. Specialized Histories

Braun, F., *Geschichte der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Synode von Iowa und andern Staaten, 1854-1929*, Wartburg Publ. House, Chicago, 1929.

Deindoerfer, Johannes, *Geschichte der Evangel.-Luth. Synode von Iowa und andern Staaten*, Wartburg Publ. House, Chicago, 1897.

Deindoerfer, J., *Kurzgefasste Geschichte der Evangel.-Luth. Synode von Iowa und andern Staaten von der Gruendung bis zum Jubeljahr 1904*, Wartburg Publ. House, Chicago, 1904.

Eisenberg, C. G., *Geschichte des ersten Dakota-Distriktes der evangelisch-lutherischen Synode von Iowa u. a. S.: Ein Gedenkblatt der gnaedigen Fuehrungen Gottes durch mehr denn fuenfundzwanzig Jahre*, privately printed, preface dated 1922.

Fritschel, Geo. J., *Aus den Tagen der Vaeter: Geschichten aus den Anfangszeiten der Iowa-Synode*, Wartburg Publ. House, Chicago, 1930.

Fritschel, Gottfried, *Geschichte der christlichen Missionen unter den Indianern Nordamerikas im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert Nebst einer Beschreibung der Religion der Indianer*, G. Loehe, Nuernberg, 1870.

Mgebroff, Johannes, *Geschichte der Ersten Deutschen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Synode in Texas*, Privately printed, 1902.

Peter, P. A., and Schmidt, Wm., *Geschichte der Allgemeinen Evang.-Lutherischen Synode von Ohio und andern Staaten*, Columbus, Ohio, 1900.

Staack, Henry F., *The Iowa Synod's Attempt at Missionary Work Among the Indians, 1859-1864*, Article in *Augustana Historical Society Publications*, Number 2, Rock Island, Ill., 1932.

Zeilinger, G. J., *1854-1929 A Missionary Synod With a Mission: A Memoir for the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Iowa and Other States*, Wartburg Publ. House, Chicago, 1929.